DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 845 CS 010 411

AUTHOR Bravi, Gerald; And Others
TITLE Reading/Writing Immersion: A Decision Making Literacy Development Project. Final Report: Year 1.
INSTITUTION Manitoba Univ., Winnipeg. Faculty of Education.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 90
NOTE 126p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Basic Skills; Early Intervention; Foreign Countries; *Formative Evaluation; Grade 1; *High Risk Students; Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Writing Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Manitoba; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a process evaluation conducted after the first year of a 2-year literacy development project designed to assist grade 1 teachers at 4 Manitoba schools in becoming more effective in working with "at-risk" students to meet reading and writing performance expectancies. The report includes results from four resource teacher surveys, two administrator/principal interviews, and two facilitator/university professor interviews investigating project-related concerns (e.g., expectations, usefulness, involvement, support, meetings, materials, goals, training component, and suggestions). The report also includes complete ethnographic field notes (arranged according to beginning, middle and observation stages) as well as questionnaire/interview instruments with complete statistical data. (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 327 845

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION-MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gerald Brain
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FINAL REPORT: YEAR 1
June 1, 1990

The University of Manitoba
Faculty of Education

Gerald Brain, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Educational Psychology

Cary Elkarr, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Language Arts

Paul Hedak, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Educational Psychology

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

FINAL REPORT: YEAR 1
June 1, 1990

The University of Manitoba
Faculty of Education

Gerald Bravi, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Educational Psychology

Gary Kilarr, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
Language Arts

Paul Madak, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Educational Psychology

Acknowledgements

The preparation of this report was made possible through the cooperation and efforts of teachers, administrators, children and support staff of St. James-Assiniboia School Disvision #2 and Winnipeg School Division #1.

Special thanks are extended to The Winnipeg Core Area Initatives and the Inner City Branch, Manitoba Education and Training for funding this project.

The opinions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the school divisons or the funding agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	4
METHOD	7
Teacher Surveys	7
Administrator Interviews	9
University Staff Interviews	10
Ethnographic Observations	10
RESULTS	12
Teacher Survey Results	12
Project expectations	12
Project usefulness	16
Meetings	20
Materials	23
Project support	30
School visits	32
Group observation sessions	34
Suggestions	36
Administrator Interview Results	37
Project expectations	38
Project usefulness	39
Administrator involvement	40
Project support	41
Classroom changes	42
Program quality	43
Suggestions	43
University Staff Interview Results	44
Program goals and objectives	45
Program support	46
Training component	46
Observations	48
Classroom program	49
Problems/concerns	50
Summary	51
Overview of the Ethnographic Field Notes	52
The beginning stage	53
The middle stage	56
The observation stage	57

PAGE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 59

Recommendations 61

REFERENCES 64

APPENDIX A 65

APPENDIX B 79

APPENDIX C 93

APPENDIX D 110

APPENDIX E 117

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

FINAL REPORT: YEAR 1

INTRODUCTION

The Reading/Writing Immersion project, approved for the four schools of Brooklands, David Livingstone, William Whyte, and Dufferin, officially began on September 14, 1989. This project was designed to assist grade 1 teachers in becoming more effective at working with students who are "at-risk" of failing to develop the reading and writing performance expectancies said teachers held for them. Since one of the purposes of this project was to promote the project throughout the four schools, a resource teacher from each of the schools was identified by the school's principal to take part. In these four schools, resource teachers function as collaborative, school-based consultants. It was envisioned that the consultative-collaborative nature of their role would serve to build an ethos, or climate for collective language arts efforts in each school. Collegial consultation efforts were perceived as one way of pooling and effectively multiplying the knowledge base and skills stemming from the project. Therefore, a total of four grade 1 teachers, four resource teachers, and three Faculty of Education (University of Manitoba) staff members took part in the Reading/Writing Immersion project during the 1989/90 school year.

The project is made up of three components. The first was a study group component, which took place between September, 1989 and December, 1989. This component was carried out at the Faculty of Education, University of

Manitoba and involved the presentation and discussion of issues related to the teaching of reading and writing skills.

Second, an applied component which took place between January, 1990 and June, 1990. In the applied component participants utilized their newly developed skills in their classrooms with students they had identified as being at-risk of not meeting reading/writing performance expectancies. Another aspect of the applied component involved the participants observing each other in the classroom setting. This allowed the teachers to view the modeling of a variety of teaching techniques. The observation sessions were also utilized to provide participants with constructive feedback regarding their instruction and to assist with the analyze student performance.

The third component will take place during the 1990-91 school year and consists of the extension of the project into additional classrooms in each of the target schools. At the time this report is being written, each of the four schools are making specific plans as to how they will approach the process of project extension.

An important aspect of this project was that it was designed to operate as a collaborative model. That is, all of the participants were to work together to design the specific direction of the project. The basic premise of the project was that effective teachers are competent "decision makers" and that future professional growth is dependent on the ability of teachers to monitor or reflect on their teaching performance. Therefore, the study group component of this project was not the traditional lecture style university class. The study group established agendas, topics for discussion, book study sessions, book fairs, cooperative reporting and other joint activities. In these sessions the university personnel acted as facilitators. A second aspect of the

collaborative approach was that it allowed each school to develop their own unique program based on the specific characteristics of their school community.

One funding condition was that this project be evaluated, therefore, an evaluation plan was designed and accepted by the project's two Management Committees (see Evaluation Outline, October 12, 1989). This plan called for a process evaluation (an evaluation of the implementation of the project) during the project's first year of operation and an outcome evaluation (effects of the project on the students) to take place during the project's second year. A two part design was selected as it allows for complete project implementation prior to the assessment of student outcomes.

The evaluation process includes four first grade/resource teacher surveys and two principal interviews during the 1989-90 school year. Additionally, the two university professors who acted as facilitators were interviewed twice during the same time period. An ethnographic log was kept of the events which took place during study group sessions and classroom observations.

The four teacher survey points were selected so as to provide accurate information about progress at critical junctures of the project. That is, while one or two survey points might have provided overall project information, it was thought that four carefully selected survey points would provide information on changes that occurred as the project progressed from one stage to the next. Information collected in this manner would allow those responsible for the project to look at each process individually, rather than just at the project as a whole.

Ethnographic data was collected in order to provide a record of the classroom observations and study group sessions. This information provided a necessary second data source for assessing project delivery. This design should provide those responsible for the project with very specific and, therefore, more useful information. Information of this type will be necessary if the project is to be implemented in other schools/school divisions.

The purpose of this document is to provide those responsible for the management of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project (R/WI) with the results of the process evaluation carried out during year 1.

METHOD

Teacher Surveys

Teacher surveys were scheduled to coincide with the conclusion of each critical phase in the project. The first survey date was October 19, 1989. This was the point at which the 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. introductory study group meetings ended and the 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. half-day meetings began. The second survey was scheduled when the initial half-day classroom observations were added to the the half-day study group meetings (January 17, 1990) at the university. The third survey took place two-thirds of the way through classroom observation period.(March 21, 1990). The final survey is scheduled for June 1, 1990, the end of the first year of the project (at the time this report was written, the fourth survey had not been completed).

The first teacher survey was 26 questions long. It was developed by the project researcher and was reviewed by individuals from Inner City Initiative,

and the Director of Research from the Winnipeg School Division No.1 (see Appendix A for a copy of the October, 1989 survey).

As stated above, the first survey was scheduled to take place on October 19, 1989. However, since the October 19, 1989 meeting was cancelled, the survey was completed by the participants at the start of the October 26, 1989 meeting. Since the October 26, 1989 meeting marked the start of the half day meetings, it was felt that very little, if anything, was lost by waiting the extra week.

The second survey was developed and reviewed in the same manner as the first. Since study group meetings had been expanded to a half-day, and the university staff had visited each school and observed each of the classroom teachers, the second survey was expanded to 31 questions (see Appendix B for a copy of the January, 1990 survey).

The third survey was scheduled to be completed on March 21, 1990. On that date three of the participants were ill and the survey was postponed until the next meeting, April 4, 1990. A meeting was not held on March 28, 1990, as this coincided with Spring holidays. Since the schools were not in session between these two dates, it is unlikely that the delay affected the data.

One week prior to each survey the participants were informed that it would be the first item of business on the next week's agenda. They were also informed of the procedures used to maintain confidentiality. No one connected with the project had access to their individual responses. Surveys were handed out and completed at the beginning of the scheduled study group meeting. Participants were provided with an envelope and enclosed the completed surveys in these. The sealed envelopes were delivered to a research assistant. The research assistant was responsible for coding the data and

entering it into the university's mainframe computer. Only the research assistant saw the completed surveys. This procedure protected the identity of the teachers and also prevented individuals from being accidentally identified from their handwriting.

The only individual in the room when the participants completed the surveys was the project researcher. He sat at the far end of the room, and was there only to answer questions (approximately four questions were asked - all were clarification type questions). Completing the surveys took approximately 20 - 30 minutes. The results of each survey were shared with the teachers as soon as the data were compiled.

Administrator Interviews

School administrators were also interviewed as part of the evaluation design. As they were not directly involved in the project, it was not considered essential to collect information from them as often as from the participating teachers. Only two interviews were conducted.

School administrator interviews contained 12 questions. These questions were developed by the project researcher and reviewed by individuals from Inner City Initiative and the Director of Research from the Winnipeg School Division No.1 (See Appendix D for a copy of the interview schedules).

Interviews took place during the second week of November, 1989 and the third week of April, 1990. Each school administrator was interviewed on an individual basis by Inner City Initiative's researcher. The interviews took approximately 30-45 minutes to complete.

University Staff Interviews

The two university staff members acting as project facilitators were interviewed twice during the project's first year. These interview schedules were developed by the project researcher and reviewed by individuals from Inner City Initiative and the Director of Research, Winnipeg School Division No.1 (See Appendix E for a copy of the interview schedules).

These interviews took place during the months of December, 1989 and May, 1990. Each university staff member was interviewed on an individual basis by the Winnipeg School Division's Director of Research. The interviews took approximately 30-45 minutes to complete.

Ethnographic Observations

Detailed field notes were taken at every second study group meeting. It should be noted that the every-second-meeting scenario was selected due to a time constraints in the project researcher's work schedule. The final project funding decision was made much later than expected and it was not possible for the project researcher to alter his schedule to match that of the project. However, anytime the researcher's work schedule permitted, field notes were taken more often.

Ethnographic field notes provide an annotated description of the events taking place during study group meetings and furnish a record of the changes that took place during the course of the project's first year. Field notes are not the recorded minutes of the study group meetings, these were recorded by a research assistant. Rather, they represent the impressions of the researcher regarding the interactions, emotions, issues, concerns, and reactions of project participants.

It is important to note that the researcher acted as a "participant observer".

> The participant observer, by virtue of being actively involved in the situation being observed, often gains insights and develops interpersonal relationships that are virtually impossible to achieve through any other method (Borg and Gall, 1989, p 391).

The specific methodology utilized for this study is termed ethnography of communication (Jacob, 1987).

> Ethnography of communication provides an approach and methods for understanding the patterns of social interaction characteristic of a group or groups and for analyzing the consequences of these patterns in observable "outcomes." Several ethnographers of communication have focused their analyses primarily on education (Jacob, 1987, p.21).

In this part of the project evaluation, the purpose of the data collection was to document within group communication patterns. Notes regarding communication patterns were transcribed on to a word processing program for analysis. Results from this analysis were combined with information from the teacher surveys, and a more detailed account of the first year of the R/WI Project was developed.

The remainder of this report will present the evaluation data collect during the first year of the R/WI Project. Confidentiality has been maintained through the use of a group data only approach.

RESULTS

Teacher Survey Results

Only seven participants completed each of the first two surveys. This was due to the fact that at these survey points one of the four schools did not have a resource teacher taking part in the project. In February, 1990, however, a resource teacher from this school joined the project and completed all following surveys. At each survey point all other project participants either completed or partially completed a survey.

The results of the first three surveys are presented together in order to facilitate the comparison of responses to questions that appeared on all three. Questions which appeared on only one of the surveys will be discussed separately.

The results of the fourth survey, which had not been administered at the time of this report, will be provided in a supplemental document. This document will be presented to those responsible for the R/WI Project in September, 1990.

Project Expectations

1. Do you feel that you are aware of all of the goals and objectives of this program?

This question was asked on each of the first two surveys. On the October, 1989 survey, 3 (42.9%) of the seven participants felt that they were aware of the goals and objectives of the project. In January, 1990, 6 (85.7%) reported

feeling that they were aware of them. This represents a substantial gain in the number who were aware of the goals and objectives of the project.

In October,1989, when asked to comment about project goals and objectives, one individual voiced a concern about there being objectives that were not stated, and one reported feeling that the goals/objectives would change over time.

The only comment made on the January, 1990 survey stated that "neither the participant nor parents were expecting that the 1/2 time teacher would take over the language arts program after Christmas."

Since all but one individual stated that they were aware of project goals on the January, 1990 survey, this question was not included on the March, 1990 survey.

16. At this point in the project, is the project: If not what you thought, how is it different?

In October, 1989, 2 (28.6%) participants responded that the project was "exactly" what they thought it would be and 4 (57.1%) reported that the project was "very close" to what they thought it would be. One (14.3%) individual reported that it was "not at all" what they thought it would be. In response to how they thought the program was different than expected, one individual reported that she felt her expectations differed from those of the university staff, another reported that she didn't realize that she would be providing explanations on how to teach inner city students and two others reported they were expecting more "concrete ideas" about specific kids.

On the January, 1990 survey this item was question #19. On this survey 2 (28.6%) participants responded that the project was "exactly" what they thought it would be and 5 (71.4%) participants rated the project as being "very

close" to what they thought it would be. In response to how they thought the program was different than expected: one reported that she thought the project would be more directive ". . . until I found out by questioning that it was supposed to be unstructured".

On the March, 1990 survey this item was question #24. On this survey 2 (28.6%) participants responded that the project was "exactly" what they thought it would be, 5 (71.4%) participants rated the project as being "very close" to what they thought it would be and 2 (25.0%) participants felt that it was "somewhat close" to what you thought it would be. No written in responses were provided on the March, 1990 survey.

19.a. List the three most important things that you thought you would get out of the project.

b. At this point in the project, how confident are you that the above three expectations will be reached? Why or why not?

In October, 1989, all 7 participants responded: "Effective teaching strategies in reading and writing" to the first part of question 19. Two also felt that communication with other teachers was an important anticipated outcome. Another two thought they would acquire the wherewithal to establish a good literature based program.

When asked how confident they were about reaching that expectation, 3 (42.9%) replied that they were "very confident" and 4 (57.1%) replied that they were "somewhat confident". No comments were made regarding the why or why not component of the question.

On the January, 1990 survey this item was question #24, and part a. of the question was omitted. At this date, the participants' confidence level had

not changed. No comments were made regarding the why or why not component of the question.

On the March, 1990 survey this item was question #27 and part a. of the question was omitted. In response to this survey 5 (62.5%) participants indicated that they were "very confident" and 3 (37.5%) replied that they were "somewhat confident" that their expectations for the project would be reached.

With regards to the why or why not component of this question, 2 participants commented that they "have been helped so much" by the project, 1 participant remarked that she had been "helped with regards to the use of strategies", and another reported she had been "helped in dealing with students at varying ability levels".

17. Are the topic areas that have been covered to this date, the topic area that you thought would be covered? If no, how is it different?

On the October, 1990 survey 5 (71.4%) of the 7 participants reported that the topic areas covered so far were what they had expected. On this date, 2 individuals did not answer the question. In response to the second part of this question, 2 participants indicated that they "expected specific teaching strategies would be covered".

This was question #20 on the January, 1990 survey. On this survey all 7 participants reported that the topic areas covered so far were what they had expected. There were no responses to the second part of the question.

On the March, 1990 survey this item was question #25. On this survey 6 (75.0%) of the participants stated that the topic areas covered were what they had expected and 1 (12.5%) individual stated that the topic areas were not what they had expected. Once again, there were no responses to the second part of the question.

On the January, 1990 survey the following 2 questions concerning project expectations were added. They did not appear on any other survey.

23. Going back to September, was the time you have put into the project:
Do you have any additional comment/concerns/suggestions to make regarding the amount of time taken up by this project?

In response to this question 5 (71.4%) participants reported they had put in "much more time" than expected, 1 (14.3%) indicated they had put in a "bit more time" than expected and another (14.3%) stated they had put in a "lot less" than expected. The following comments were made: "I am away from my class too much"; "I need more prep time due to the Tuesday meetings"; and "I worked long and hard on the write-up for this project in order to meet the December 7, deadline".

24. If you had the choice, would you want to be able to receive university course credit for this project?

Six (85.7%) participants responded "yes" to this question and 1 (14.3%) reported she was "undecided".

Project Usefulness

18. Is the project turning out to be as useful to you as you thought it would be?
Comments/suggestions for improvements.

On the October, 1989 survey 3 (42.9%) participants reported that the project was turning out to be "very useful" and 4 (57.1%) reported is was "somewhat useful". One participant commented that she "expected the usefulness of the project to increase as the project progressed". Another felt she would "find it more useful as more structure was introduced" and a third commented that she "found it difficult to compare ideas and techniques as not all schools were doing the same thing".

This question was item #21 on the January, 1990 survey. Participant responses to the first part of the question were identical to those made on the October survey. There were no written comments to the second part of the question.

On the March, 1990 survey this question was item #26. Seven (87.5%) participants rated the project as "very useful" and 1 (12.5%) rated it "somewhat useful". Once again, there were no comments to the second part of the question.

23. Given that the program has just begun, how would your rate the following items?

a.) I find that the information presented so far has been:

b.) I find that I am already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in my classroom.

c.) I find that I have already adopted some of the ideas/techniques as part of what I do in my classroom.

d.) Based on your experiences thus far, what do you feel is the probability that you will make changes to what you do in the classroom?
Comments.

On the October, 1989 survey 4 (57.1%) participants reported that the information presented in the project was "very useful" and 3 (42.9%) participants responded that the information was "useful". Results from this survey also indicated that 6 (85.7%) participants were already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in their classrooms. One participant did not respond to this item. Not only were the majority of the participants trying ideas/techniques, furthermore 5 (71.4%) also reported they had incorporated these into their everyday classroom procedures. One participant indicated she had not done this and another did not respond to this item. Five (71.4%) participants stated they were "100% certain" that as a result of the project they

would make changes in their classrooms. One (14.3%) participant was "85% certain" such changes would be made and 1 (14.3%) participant did not respond to the item.

Two participants commented that they had used some of the ideas/techniques prior to participating in the R/WI Project. Another participant indicated that she will always make changes in her classroom.

In January, 1990 these same items were numbered 28.a.-d. Once again, 4 (57.1%) participants reported that the information presented in the project was "very useful" and 3 (42.9%) participants responded that the information was "useful". Results from this survey also indicated that 6 (85.7%) participants were already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in their classrooms. One participant did not respond to this item. Not only were all the responding participants trying ideas/techniques, but 7 (100%) also reported they had incorporated these into their everyday classroom procedures. Three (42.9%) participants were "100% certain" that as a result of the project they would make changes in their classrooms and 4 (57.1%) participants were "85% certain" such changes would be made. One participant commented that the project had helped make it easier to present a rationale for what happens in her classroom.

In March, 1990 these same items were numbered 31.a. - d., and subquestions e and f were added. On this survey 7 (87.5%) participants reported that the information presented in the project was "very useful" and 1 (12.5%) participant responded that the information was "useful". Results from this survey also indicated that 8 (100%) participants were already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in their classrooms. Not only were all the participants trying ideas/techniques, but 8 (100%) also reported they had

incorporated these into their everyday classroom procedures. Seven (87.5%) participants were "100% certain" that as a result of the project they would make changes in their classrooms and 1 (57.1%) participant was "85% certain" such changes would be made.

The new items added to question 31 on the March, 1990 survey were:

e.) Based on your experiences thus far, have you seen positive changes in the performance of your students that can be stated to be a direct result of this project?

f.) Do you feel that this project has helped you to improve your teaching skills?

Six (75%) participants indicated that they had noticed "many positive changes" in the performance of their students that were a direct result of the project. Two (25%) noted a "few positive changes" that could be attributed to the project. All 8 (100%) participants reported that the R/WI Project had helped improve their teaching skills.

One participant commented that they felt "having the support of other professionals in discussions and to share ideas with was an important feature of the project". Another reported that it was "beneficial to have the time to develop new approaches without the pressure of having to monitor the whole class".

This question was also added to the March, 1990 survey.

32. Name/describe some changes that you have already made in the way you work with children that have been a direct result of this project.

In response to this question, 4 participants indicated that the project had helped them to fine tune their observation skills. Four participants also reported that the decisions they now make reflect theory and have a positive

effect on their students. Finally, four reported that their classroom learning environments had improved and were being used to the fullest extent.

Meetings

2. The meeting for the Reading/Writing Immersion Program have been held in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. How do you feel about this location?

This question was asked only on the October, 1989 survey. Four (57.1%) participants reported that the location of the meetings was "fine", 2 (28.6%) indicated that the location was "too far from my home school" and 1 (14.3%) responded that it "did not matter where the meetings were located".

3. Rate the room in which the meetings have been held in by circling the most appropriate response.
a.) room is clean
b.) room is well lighted
c.) size of the room is adequate
d.) temperature of room is comfortable

On both the October, 1989 and the January, 1990 surveys, a large majority of the participants rated the temperature of the room as being "very poor" or "poor". This finding is not surprising given the high temperatures in the room due to a heat wave that occurred in the city just prior to the October survey, and the fact that temperatures inside the meeting room always tended to parallel those outside the building. A room change took place in the spring and temperature ratings improved.

In terms of cleanliness, lighting and room size, the rooms were rated positively by the participants on the October, January and March surveys.

4. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall organization of the meetings held so far?
Comments/suggestions for improvement.

With regards to the organization of the meetings, all 7 of the participants reported on the October and January surveys that they felt study group meetings were "well organized". On the March, 1990 survey, however, 1 (12.5%) participant rated the meetings as "very well organized", 5 (62.5%) rated them as "well organized", and 1 (12.5%) rated them as "poorly organized".

One comment/suggestion for improvement was made on the October survey. The participant indicated that "more time was needed for structured discussions".

On the January survey, 2 participants suggested that the "amount of time wasted because of late arrivals and room shuffles be reduced". Another participant suggested that conversations during surveys, which they termed disgusting, be discouraged or stopped. One participant also suggested that "early exits be discouraged".

On the March survey 2 participants thought it "seemed as though the professors were dragging out discussions in order to fill the time". Another one felt that "they had been told what they were going to do and found that it had been changed when they arrived". The participant did not indicate how often this had occurred. Finally, one participant suggested that "some topics should be discussed in large groups, but on other occasions time should be spent discussing specific children".

5. **Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the agendas of the meetings?**
Comments/suggestions for improvements.

On the October, 1989 survey, 4 (57.1%) participants reported they were "very satisfied" with the input they had with regards to meeting agendas.

Another 3 (42.9%) participants felt "somewhat satisfied". No comments/suggestions for improvements were made by the respondents.

On the January survey this item was presented as question #4. Responses to the January survey showed that 2 (28.6%) participants were "very satisfied" regarding their input and 5 (71.4%) were "somewhat satisfied". Only one participant commented with regards to this question. She stated that she felt she "could make suggestions and then see those suggestions addressed at the next meeting".

On the March survey this item was presented as question #3. Responses to the March survey indicated that 4 (50%) participants were "very satisfied", 3 (37.5%) were "somewhat satisfied" and 1 (12.5%) was "somewhat dissatisfied" with regards to their input into meeting agendas. One participant felt she was "being treated somewhat as a student in a course". Two participants felt that "insufficient time had been devoted to the sharing of teacher reports".

6. When you have made suggestions with regards to the meeting agendas, did you feel that your suggestions were given adequate consideration? Comments/suggestions.

On the October survey, 3 (42.9%) participants reported that "very adequate" consideration was given to their suggestions, 3 (42.9%) indicated that "adequate consideration" was given and 1 (14.3%) responded that "suggestions were considered, but not adequately". There was only one comment/suggestion made and that respondent indicated that "the project really made the idea of collaboration come true".

On the January survey this item was presented as question #5. Three (42.9%) participants reported that "very adequate" consideration was given to their suggestions and 4 (57.1%) reported that "adequate consideration" was

given. There were no comments/suggestions made regarding this question on the January survey.

On the March survey this item was presented as question #4. Four (50%) participants responded that their suggestions were given "very adequate" consideration, 3 (37.5%) reported "adequate" consideration was given and 1 (12.5%) indicated that their "suggestions were considered, but not adequately". One participant felt "suggestions were considered" and another commented that "more time was needed to clarify points being discussed".

Materials

7. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the materials/readings that have been provided to you? Comments/suggestions.

On the October, 1989 survey 2 (28.6%) participants reported that the materials were of "very high" quality and 5 (71.4%) responded that materials were of "high" quality. One participant suggested that "more sharing of materials as this is the best way of assessing materials". Another commented that "without the tapes referred to in the text, I am at a bit of a loss" and one suggested that there were "too many readings per week".

On the January survey this item was presented as question #6. Two (28.6%) participants reported that the materials were of "very high" quality and 5 (71.4%) responded that materials were of "high" quality. No comments/suggestions were made on that date.

On the March survey this item was presented as question #5. Five (62.5%) participants responded that the materials were of "very high" quality and 3 (37.5%) indicated that they were of "high" quality. One participant

commented that the "articles were great" and another felt she "needed six more months to read all of them".

8. Do you feel that the materials/readings provided to you thus far has presented:

On the October, 1989 survey 2 (28.6%) participants reported that the materials presented "mostly new" information and 5 (71.4%) participants responded that the materials presented "a half and half mixture" of new and old information.

On the January survey this item was presented as question #7 and the results were identical to those on the October, 1989 survey. On the March survey this item was presented as question #6. All 8 (100%) indicated that the materials presented "a half and half mixture" of new and old information.

9. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of the materials/readings provided to you? Comments/suggestions for improvement.

On the October, 1989 survey 5 (71.4%) responded that the materials/readings were "very useful" and 2 (28.6%) responded that they were "somewhat useful". On the January, 1990 survey this was question #8. Three (57.1%) of the participants reported that the information was "very useful" and 4 (57.1%) reported that they were "somewhat useful". This was question #7 on the March, 1990 survey. On that occasion 6 (75%) participants reported the the information was "very useful" and 2 (25%) stated that it was "somewhat useful" to them. On both the October and the March surveys 2 participants commented that the utility of the materials was a "strong point" of the project.

**10. How would you rate the amount of information that has been provided to you?
Comments/suggestions for improvement.**

On the October, 1989 survey 2 (28.6%) participants responded that "far too much" information had been provided, 4 (57.1%) reported that a "little too much" had been provided, and 1 (14.3%) indicated that the "right amount" had been introduced. Two participants commented that they were "getting behind", one thought we should "designate participants to read certain materials and then verbally report back", and another stated she was "not interested in everything given".

On the January, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #9. Two (28.6%) participants reported that "far too much" material had been provided, 2 (28.6%) indicated a "little too much" had been presented and 3 (42.9%) responded that the "right amount" had been provided. One participant commented that "some weeks more hectic at school" and "too much when combined with much reading".

On the March, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #8. At that time 1 (12.5%) participant reported that "far too much" material had been provided, 1 (12.5%) responded that a "little too much" had been given and 5 (62.5%) indicated that the "right amount" had been introduced. One participant did not respond to this item. Two participants suggested that "book studies should continue every week", one stated she "tried to do an adequate job and that took considerable time" and another commented that "some good handouts were passed out and not discussed".

11. How adequate was the university staff follow-up to the materials/readings (i.e., willingness to discuss/explain ideas presented in the materials/readings)? Comments/suggestions for improvement.

On the October, 1989 survey 1 (14.3%) participant reported that follow-up by university staff was "very adequate", 5 (71.4%) responded that it was "adequate" and 1 (14.3%) indicated that it was "somewhat adequate". Two participants suggested that there might be "too much material for university staff to follow-up on". One commented that "university staff questioned more than discussed or explained" and another thought that "people on the project should ask for the discussion of all articles".

On the January, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #10. One (14.3%) participant reported that follow-up by university staff was "very adequate", 2 (28.6%) responded that it was "adequate", 3 (42.9%) indicated that follow-up was "somewhat adequate" and 1 (14.3%) reported that it was "not at all adequate". Four participants commented that the university staff "tended to move too quickly" or "spent too little time" following-up certain materials.

On the March, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #9. At that time, 1 (12.5%) participant reported that follow-up by university staff was "very adequate", 5 (62.5%) indicated it was "adequate" and 1 (12.5%) responded it was "somewhat adequate". One participant did not respond to this item. Two participants suggested that they "still need time to discuss readings after we have had the opportunity to try or develop ;what we have read in our classes".

12. Do you feel that the materials/readings given to you covered the topic areas that you thought would be covered when you started the program?

On the October, 1989 survey 4 (57.1%) participants reported that there were "very few surprises" with regards to the topic areas covered and 3

(42.9%) indicated that there were a number of areas covered that they had not expected.

On the January, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #11. At that time the numbers were the reverse of the October survey. That is, 3 (42.9%) participants reported that there were "very few surprises" with regards to the topic areas covered and 4 (57.1%) indicated that there were a number of areas covered that they had not expected.

On the March, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #10. Five (62.5%) participants reported that there were "very few surprises" with regards to the topic areas covered, 2 (25%) indicated that there were a number of areas covered that they had not expected and 1 participant did not respond to this item.

13. Were there topic areas you would have liked to have received materials/readings on, but did not?
If yes, what were those topic areas?

On the October, 1989 survey 2 (28.6%) reported that they would have liked to have received materials/reading in other topic areas. The areas requested were "understanding writing" and "invented spelling". The other 5 (71.4%) participants indicated there weren't any other topic areas they would have liked to have received materials on.

On the January, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #12. At that time, 2 (28.6%) reported that they would have liked to have received materials/reading in other topic areas. The areas requested were "reading and writing instructional strategies" and "invented spelling". Four (57.2%) participants indicated there weren't any other topic areas they would have liked to have received materials on and one participant did not respond.

On the March, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #11. Three (42.9%) reported that they would have liked to have received materials/reading in other topic areas. The areas requested were "reading diagnosis", "self-monitoring/self-correction skills" and "ideas about the home and school connection". Four (57.2%) participants indicated there weren't any other topic areas they would have liked to have received materials on and one participant did not respond.

14. Given that this is a collaborative project, did you feel that you could suggest materials/readings for the group? Comments/suggestions.

On both the October, 1989 and the January, 1990 surveys, 7 (100%) participants reported that that they felt they could suggest materials/readings for the group. On the October survey one participant commented that she didn't "know of any at present" that she would suggest. On the March, 1990 survey all 8 (100%) participants responded that they felt they could suggest materials/readings for the group. No comments were made on either the January or the March surveys. On the January survey this item was presented as question #13 and on the March survey it was presented as question #12.

15. In your opinion, how would you rate the pace at which the material/readings have been presented? Comments/suggestions.

On the October, 1989 survey 5 (71.4%) participants reported that the materials had been presented at a "very fast" pace and 2 (28.6%) responded that they had been presented at a "fast, but not unreasonable" pace. One participant commented that "after teaching all day and rushing out here it's hard to digest a lot of new material".

On the January, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #14. At that time, 4 (57.1%) participants reported that the materials had been

presented at a "very fast" pace, 1 (14.3%) responded that they had been presented at a "fast, but not unreasonable" pace, 1 (14.3%) indicated the pace was "just right" and 1 (14.3%) reported the pace was "slow". A participant commented that the "pace is either fast or slow and boring".

On the March, 1990 survey this item was question #13. Three (37.5%) participants reported that the materials had been presented at a "very fast" pace, 2 (25%) responded that they had been presented at a "fast, but not unreasonable" pace and 3 (37.5%) indicated the pace was "just right". One participant commented "I would have preferred to spend more time on less material" and another felt that the "pace had been adjusted".

Between the October and January surveys, two book displays were provided for the participants by publishers of children's books. In order to evaluate participants' responses to these displays, this question was added to the January survey.

15. How useful was it to have the two book displays as part of our sessions?
Comments/suggestions.

On the January, 1990 survey 5 (71.4%) participants reported that they felt the book displays were "very useful" and 2 (28.6%) responded they felt they were "somewhat useful". Two participants comment that these displays were "great" opportunities for project members.

Project Support

20. In your opinion, how would you rate the university members of the group in the areas listed below?

a.) they are approachable

b.) they value my opinions

c.) they treated me as a professional

d.) they were willing to answer all my questions

e.) they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the classroom

f.) they suggest rather than dictate or criticize

g.) they actively look for and encourage my input

h.) they help me feel more confident about what I do in the classroom

i.) they make suggestions that are useful to me

j.) they try to make the project challenging

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

Questions 20.a. through j. on the October, 1989 survey, questions 25.a. through j. on the January, 1990 survey and questions 28.a. through j. on the March, 1990 survey presented the opinions of the participants regarding the support provided to the project by the university staff. From those results it can be seen that, overall, the ratings given to the university staff were high in all but four areas. That is, the majority of the participants felt the university staff "always" provided support. The four areas the majority of participants rated as being "sometimes" supported by university staff were: (e) "they empathized with the problems I have to deal with in the classroom"; (h)

"they help me feel more confident about what I do in the classroom"; and (i) "they make suggestions that are useful to me". There was no area the participants felt the university staff "never" supported them with.

21. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?
Comments/suggestions for improvement.

On the October, 1989 survey 4 (57.1%) participants rated Inner City Initiative support as "good" and 3 (42.9%) did not respond to the item. One participant commented that it was "too soon to comment" about Inner City Initiative support, and this might be the reason others did not respond to this question. On the January, 1990 survey 3 (42.9%) participants reported that the support was "very good", 3 (42.9%) indicated that is was "good" and 1 (14.3%) did not respond. By the March, 1990 survey, 5 (62.5%) of the participants rated the support provided by Inner City Initiative as being "very good" and 3 (37.5%) rated it as "good". On the January survey this item was question #26 and on the March survey it was question #29.

22. In your opinion, how would you rate the support being provided to this program from your school's administrator(s)? Comments/suggestions for improvements.

On the October, 1989 survey 2 (28.6%) participants rated administrator support as "very good", 4 (57.1%) rated it as "good" and 1 (14.3%) rated it as "poor". All three of the comments made indicated that there was a need for more communication between the participants and administrators. On the January survey 1 (14.3%) participant rated administrator support as "very good" and the other 6 (85.7%) rated the support as "good". No comments/suggestion were made on that survey. Responses on the March survey indicated that 3 (37.5%) participants rated administrator support as

"very good", 4 (50%) rated it as "good" and 1 (12.5%) rated it as "poor". Two participants' comments indicate that the principals were not overly involved in the project, but another commented "I really appreciate the support and guidance available when requested". On the January survey this item was question #27 and on the March survey it was question #30.

School Visits

Between October and March, the university staff had conducted a number of visits to each of the teacher participants' classrooms. During these visits the university staff observed classroom activities and provided feedback to the teachers. All visits were collaboratively scheduled with the teachers. In order to assess these school visits, the following questions were added as new questions to the January and March surveys.

16. How helpful were observations/suggestions made during the school visits in focusing the intent of the program? Comments/suggestions for improvement.

On the January, 1990 survey 1 (14.3%) participant report the visits were "very useful" in helping them to focus on the intent of the program and 4 (57.1%) responded that the visits were "somewhat useful" for this purpose. Three (28.6%) participants did not respond to this item. One participant commented "I was not observed", another suggested that the "observer could observe the behavior of 1 or 2 kids that I cannot see while teaching the whole class" and yet another commented that she "sometimes found the observer to critical".

On the March survey this item was question #14. At that time, 5 (62.5%) participants reported that the visits were "very useful" for the purpose stated

in the question and 3 (37.5%) reported that the visits were "somewhat useful" for said purpose. One participant suggested that "more school visits" would be useful and another comment that it would be great if "Gerry and/or Gary could model some reading and writing strategies with the kids".

17. How helpful were the school visits in assisting you to make connections between the material/content presented in the sessions at the university and what you do with kids? Comments/suggestions for improvement.

On the January, 1990 survey 1 (14.3%) participant rated the visits as "very useful" in assisting them in making connections and 4 (57.1%) rated them as "somewhat useful" for that purpose. Three (28.6%) participants did not respond to the item. One person commented "I was not observed".

On the March, 1990 survey this item was question #15. On that survey, 3 (37.5%) participants rated the visits as "very useful" in assisting them in making connections and 5 (62.5%) participants rate them as "somewhat useful" for that purpose. One person commented "I would like more input from the faculty staff".

18. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add about the school visits?

On the January, 1990 survey two participants commented that they found the visits very helpful and the advice to be practical. Another stated that the "professors try to come when the teacher wants them". One expressed the concern that "visits need a meeting away from distractions".

On the March, 1990 survey this item was presented as question #17. At that time two participants suggested that the visits "should be more frequent" and another stated "he [the prof] is not afraid to become involved with the kids".

On the March, 1990 the following question about school visits was added to the survey.

16. Overall, when comparing all of the components of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project (i.e., sessions at the university and group observations), how important are the school visits made by Gary and Gerry? Comments/suggestions.

To this question, 2 (25%) responded that this was the "most important" of all R/WI Project components, 5 (62.5%) participants indicated it was of "equal importance" as the other components and 1 (12.5%) participant reported that it was "not as important" as the other components. Two participants commented "it is essential that when individual children are discussed, both the professor and the teacher can relate personally". Another 2 expressed that the "visits are a link between all the schools/personnel and readings".

Group Observation Sessions

In January, group observations were begun. Each teacher's classroom was visited twice and they were observed while working with their identified R/WI students. Project participants critiqued these instructional sessions and monitored actions or behaviors requested by the classroom teacher. All group members took part in these school visits. The following questions, which appeared only on the March survey, tap the participant's reactions to the observation sessions.

18. How helpful were the observations/suggestions made to you during the group observational sessions? Comments/suggestions.

On the March, 1990 survey 2 (25%) participants reported that the observation sessions were "very helpful" and 6 (75%) indicated they were

"somewhat helpful". One participant comment that the "observations were very good" and another suggested that they be "spread further apart".

19. How helpful were the group observational sessions in assisting you to make connections between the material/content presented in the sessions at the university and what you do with kids? Comments/suggestions.

In response to this question, 3 (37.5%) participants reported that the observation sessions were "very helpful" in helping them to make the connections suggested above, 4 (50%) indicated they were "somewhat helpful" for this purpose and 1 (12.5%) participant responded that they were "not very helpful" in making connections. On participant suggested that "to see in practice what has been discussed and reported made our meetings more useful".

20. Overall, when comparing all of the components of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project (i.e., sessions at the university and school visits), how important are the group observational sessions? Comments/suggestions.

Only 1 (12.5%) participant reported that this was "most important component" of the project, 4 (50%) indicated it was "equal in importance to the other two components" and 3 (37.5%) responded that it was "not as important as the other two components". Two participants suggested that "there are too many visits to each school". One commented that "after hearing about kids and classrooms in other schools, it was great to see the actual situation" and another commented that it was a "great forum for new ideas and new perspectives".

21. In your opinion, how many group observational sessions should be included in this project?

Two (25%) participants indicated that "one" session would have been enough, 3 (37.5%) reported that "two" were necessary and 2 (25%) responded that "three" sessions should have been included.

22. When do you feel that the group observational sessions should have started?
Comments/suggestions.

Five (62.5%) participants responded that group observation sessions should have started "earlier in the program" and 3 (37.5%) indicated that they should have started "exactly when they did start". One participant suggested that "it would have been great to see things as they were in the other schools in November".

23. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add about the group observational sessions?

One participant wished "Gerry's timetable would have allowed him to visit other schools with everyone else". This was another scheduling problem that result from late project approval. Another commented that "the Wednesday afternoon rehash of the morning activities was very boring to those who had been there in the morning [a waste of 30-45 minutes". Six participants chose not to record any comments/concerns.

Suggestions

When the participants were asked for suggestions regarding the program, very few were given. The reader is directed to questions 24, 25 and 26 on the October,1989 survey (Appendix A), questions 29, 30 and 31 on the January, 1990 survey (Appendix B) and questions 33 and 34 on the March, 1990 survey for a list of the suggestions that were made. As can be seen, none of

the suggestions were given more than once. While it is important that they these suggestions be considered, they need not be repeated here.

Administrator Interview Results

This section of the document was written by the Research Consultant for Inner City Initiative.

Two administrator interviews were conducted, one in November, 1989 and another in April, 1990. On each survey all school administrator were interviewed on an individual basis by Inner City Initiative's researcher.

After the completion of the second, a comparison between the first and second interviews was carried out. Based on that comparison it was concluded that there were only two major differences in the administrators' responses between the first and second interviews. **The first difference** was that the administrators discussed issues related to observed project effects on teachers and students, and **the second** was their opinions regarding the extension of the program in year two of the project.

As a result of these minimal differences and for the sake of brevity, it was felt that only the results of the second interview need be presented in this document. For those interested in reading the results of the first administrators' interviews, these are presented in the "Teacher and Administrator Survey Results: Interim Report #2" (Madak, Bravi, and Kilarr, 1990).

Project Expectations

1. Do you feel that you are aware of all of the goals and objectives of this program? Comments/suggestions.

All four (4) administrators reported that they were aware of all the goals and objectives of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project. One (1) administrator commented that he/she agreed with all the goals and that the children were showing great promise. He/she also reported that the teachers had exhibited significant growth and that he/she (i.e.,the administrator) was excited about the program.

2. What are your goals for this project?

The four (4) administrators cited a variety of personal goals for th R/WI Project. One personal goal common to all four (4) administrators involved expanding the program beyond the target group in order to provide services to students in other grades. Other personal project goals included:

- a way of doing the program next year without the first year resources in a meaningful way, monitoring progress and sharing information about program strategies, and ways to address the program for the coming year;
- to offer effective programming for high-risk grade one students in the area of language arts; and,
- get at-risk youngsters hooked on reading and writing and foster a love for reading.

3. While the project has only just begun, how confident are you that your goals for the project will be met? Why do you feel this way?

In response to this question, three (3) of the four (4) administrators stated that they were "very confident" their goals for the project would be met and the fourth administrator reported that she/he was "somewhat confident" about this happening.

In response to the second half of this question, three (3) administrators reported that they felt "very confident" of goal attainment because of staff enthusiasm and commitment. The other administrator was "somewhat confident" because he/she had some concerns with how the program would be handled next year. Additional comments included:

- input from the university and support from Inner City has been good;
- training has been quite good, classroom materials have really helped. Also, the school was supportive of the program. Parental involvement and interest increased;
- students requiring attention have been identified; and,
- I have confidence in the people involved and the process being used.

Project Usefulness

4. Again, while the project has only just begun, how useful do you feel this project has been to the teacher involved in the project?
Comments.

To this question, all four (4) administrators reported that they felt the project had been "very useful" to the teacher involved in the project. One (1) administrator commented that the teachers have had access to a lot of information and the opportunity to develop new skills, especially in the area of assessment. He/she also noted that the teacher has acquired new ways of looking at and meeting children's needs. Another administrator commented that the project gave the teacher a lot of confidence in delivering language arts programs, especially as the teacher was not afraid to take risks to challenge the kids. One (1) administrator stated that the program was very useful to the teacher because it enforced communication with university

personnel and teachers outside the school. Finally, a fourth administrator claimed that both teachers had found the project useful.

5. Again, while the project has only just begun, how useful do you feel this project has been to your school? Comments.

Two (2) administrators rated that the Reading/Writing Immersion project had been "very useful" to the school, a third rated it as "useful" and the fourth indicated that the project had been "somewhat useful" to the school.

One (1) administrator commented that the techniques and knowledge gained by the teachers had been shared so other students benefited and that the program had a positive effect on student feelings of self-worth. He/she also noted that the children see it as a privilege to be in the program and involvement in it has no negative overtones. Another positive aspect of the project noted by this administrator was that the newly purchased materials had been shared with other classrooms. Another administrator commented that "as this year was the training phase, the proof will be in next year's results, although there are results now". A fourth administrator qualified her/his response with the statement that "the project was limited to a small number of children and was not spread out beyond this group".

Administrator Involvement

6. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the project? Comments/suggestions for improvements.

All four (4) administrators reported that they were "very satisfied" with the opportunities they had had to provide input into the project. Comments to the second part of the question included:

- initially I was concerned, but now I have no concerns. I feel satisfied I've had the opportunity to have input; and,

- I was very satisfied due to the Management team being on site.

Project Support

7. At this point in the project, rate the university staff with regard to the following areas.

a.) they are approachable

b.) they were willing to answer all my questions

c.) they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the school

d.) they actively look for and encourage my input

e.) they make suggestions that are useful to me

f.) they try to make the project challenging

g.) they are easy to reach when I need to talk to them

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

With regards to this question, the four administrators rated the university staff as follows:

a. all four (4) administrators responded that the staff were "always" approachable.

b. all four (4) administrators stated that the staff were "always"11 willing to answer their questions.

c. three (3) administrators responded that the staff "always" empathized with their problems, and one (1) replied "sometimes".

d. two (2) administrators responded that the staff "always" looked for and encouraged administrator input and the two (2) other replied that this was "sometimes" the case.

e. three (3) of the administrators stated that the university staff "always" made suggestions that were useful to them and one (1) reported that this was "sometimes" the case.

f. all four (4) administrators responded that the university staff "always made the project challenging.

g. one (1) administrators responded that staff were "always"easy to reach , two (2) replied that this was true "sometimes"and the fourth indicated that he/she did not know as the need to call had not been frequent.

One comment was made concerning this question:

- The connection between the university and school has been strong. The management committee has been the biggest source of information dissemination.

8. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?
Comments/suggestions for improvement.

All four (4) administrators rated the support provided to the Reading/Writing Immersion program by the Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education as being "very good". Comments made by one administrator included:

- Erika has been on top of what is going on. I've been quite pleased with the support.

Classroom Changes

9. In your opinion, have changes actually occurred in the project classroom?
Comments.

All four (4) administrators reported that "yes, a number of changes" had actually occurred in the project classrooms. Their comments regarding this were as follows:

- The teacher is more accepting of what the youngsters are able to do and less anxious about skills acquisitions. The teacher is able to see growth and success where previously there was frustration. The outlook has improved. Classroom management has shown improvements as a result of kids being challenged and programmed for appropriately;

- There has been more of a diagnostic approach to instruction and teaching;

- The teacher has become more aware of the individual learning styles of the students and better able to assist in the academic development of the students; and

- The teacher's approach to the target group has improved. Teachers indicate that the students' progress has improved; however, teachers wonder what will happen to the students next year. How do we keep them going with motivation?

Program Quality

10. At this point in time, how would you rate the quality of the project?
Comments.

Two (2) of the administrators rated the quality of the project as being "very high", while the two (2) others rated it as "high". Administrator comments included:

- What I need to see more of is other kids making the strides the target kids are, but maybe I'm expecting too much. What I need is two or three teachers involved to meet the needs of my student population that will come down the road; and,

- It is my hope that professional development activities and communication between program teachers at the three schools will continue possibly 2 or 3 times next year.

Suggestions

11. At this point in time, do you have any suggestions that you would like to see implemented in order to improve the quality of the project? If yes, what are they?

In response to this question the administrators made the following suggestions:

- it is imperative that the project teacher be given adequate release time to assess, diagnose and provide remediation for identified students;

- extra support; release time on a less frequent basis than now for the teacher leader in coming years; a structured approach; a 1/2 day or 1 day inservice for the target teachers for the coming year, release time for meetings to communicate issues; and,

- I'm quite quite satisfied right now. But if I had to do it again I would prefer to see that the teacher not be taken away from the classroom during school hours. Half-support should begin at the beginning of the program so that there will be less disruption and more consistency.

12. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

In response to this question the administrators had these comments or concerns:

- I hope that those people making decisions about funding the project would reconsider some possible add ons that weren't predicted in the initial budget; some teachers have suggested continuing the group of teachers for next year;

- I'm really glad I've been involved with the project. It has benefited the teachers, students and the school. I am optimistic that the evaluation will have positive results. One concern has been learning to do without my resource teacher once a week; and,

- In general, it has been a positive experience. I sense there is value, but it needs to be a bigger impact on the school population, even if its only in the primary area. Inservicing is important in this area; teachers need time to familiarize themselves with goals etc., and we need a structure that would ensure continuity.

University Staff Interview Results

This section of the document was written by the Director of Research for the Winnipeg School Division No.1.

The two university members who were responsible for the study group sessions and school observations were interviewed twice during the first year. The first interview occurred during the second week of December, 1989 and the second interview occurred during the first week of May, 1990. Each university professor was interviewed individually by the Director of Research

for the Winnipeg School Division No.1, and the interviews took about 30 to 45 minutes to complete (see Appendix E for a copy of the interview schedules). It should be noted that the first interview occurred in a face-to-face situation, while the second was conducted over the telephone. The results of the two interviews are presented together for comparison purposes.

Program Goals and Objectives

In December, 1989 the university members were asked what they thought the goals and objectives were, and how confident they were that the goals would be met. The two members agreed that the goals of the Reading/Writing Immersion project were:

1. The empowerment of teachers to feel they are in charge and to be decision-makers.
2. To develop a core of teachers who are trained in methods of teaching, reading and writing in an integrated language arts program.
3. The improvement of children's reading and writing by improving the skills of the teachers.

In December, both professors were very confident that the goals would be met because, they said, they believed in teacher empowerment and had observed changes in the classrooms. By May, one of the university professors only felt somewhat confident that the goals of the project would be met, because he had been hoping the teachers would be further ahead in the program. He felt they had not been able to devote as much time to the project as he had hoped. The other professor still felt very confident that the goals of the project would be met.

Program Support

For the most part, the professors felt they received good support for the program for the funders, the divisions administrations, the University of Manitoba, and the principals. Comments indicated that they felt the delay in the Winnipeg School Division's decision about the funding and starting the project made things difficult for them. This was because they had not been able to negotiate a reduced workload. They felt the project should not be added on to a full-time workload.

The professors felt the school principals provided good support to the project. In December both professors stated that they perceived a lack of communication between the principals and the teachers. In May they said that the principals were providing good support and could provide better support to the project by being more involved with the teachers (i.e., having regular meetings; observing the teachers in the classroom).

Training Component

The university members were asked to comment about the collaborative approach of the project. In December both professors were very satisfied with the effort the teachers had put into the project. They said that initially the teachers had been anxious about the process, but that had disappeared. They said they had seen improvement and growth in the teachers. One professor mentioned that the the principals were not taking part in the collaboration, although they (university members) expected that the principals were to be part of the collaborative approach.

In May one professor was very satisfied with the effort the teachers were making to provide input into the project, while the other professor was

somewhat satisfied. He said that it had taken the teachers awhile to understand what the collaborative approach was because none had much previous experience in collaborating.

When asked if there had been changes in the collaboration, both university members said yes. In December they noted that trust had been established among the group members (teachers and university members) and the teachers were, therefore, more open to the goals and objectives. One professor said he had noticed a change in the relationship between the classroom teachers and the resource teachers. In May the university members said the teachers felt they had more of a stake in the collaborative process and had put more into the project. They felt that there had been a change in teacher empowerment and that the teachers' expectations had changed.

In December and again in May, both university professors were asked if they thought that at that point in the project, the project was what they thought it would be. Both professors felt that the project was very close to what they expected, and that the pace at which the project had been moving along was just right. By May both felt that the project was somewhat close to what they thought it would be. They said with the mix of schools, some schools were closer to expectations then others. They commented that they had expected the teachers to have a better understanding of how to record data on the students.

However, both professors said that they had seen many positive changes in the classrooms. By December they had seen changes in instruction, changes in teachers' attitudes towards students, and changes in the students. Again in May, the professors said that many positive changes had occurred between December and May. There were changes in classroom management

skills, changes in teachers' attitudes towards the capabilities of their students, and changes in instructional strategies.

In May the university members were asked if they thought the teachers needed more training. Both said yes, however, both stressed that it did not imply that the teachers were lacking. They said that the teachers had acquired a number of skills and were at the point where they needed refinement of those skills. One professor said that in any program there was a need for on-going inservicing because as changes occur, new problems or situations will arise. Some of the suggested areas for inservicing or refinement of skills were: (1) develop clearer understanding of whole language strategies, (2) how to work with children as a group, (3) how to use more of the context of the classroom in their instruction, (4) how to analyze what kids do when they read and write, and (5) how to collaborate with their peers and make changes.

Observations

During the first part of the project (September to December), the university members visited each of the classrooms to observe the teachers and give them some feedback. Between January and May, the entire group (teachers and professors) visited each of the classrooms to observe and provide comments. The university members were asked in December if the first round of observations should have begun sooner. Both said no, because a level of trust with the teachers needed to be established before they could go into the classrooms. However, one professor noted that it would have been beneficial to have gathered baseline observation data for comparison purposes.

Both professors felt the second round of whole group observations had been necessary. One professor said he would have liked the group to do more of them. As the observations progressed, the group changed from being very supportive to making more constructive comments. Later on, the group was more able to make critical, as well as, supportive remarks to the teacher being observed.

Classroom Program

Beginning in January, half-time teachers were added to the three Winnipeg School Division schools. The half-time teacher stated in the fall in the St. James-Assiniboia School Division. During the May interview, the university members were asked some questions about the role of the half-time teacher in the project classrooms, about teachers working with the students, and about the identified students themselves.

Both professors felt that the role of the half-time teacher was to work under the direction of classroom teacher, to allow the teacher time to do record keeping, visit other classrooms, etc. Both university member strongly felt that the extra half-time teacher was not to be used to take over the whole class while the classroom teacher worked with identified students on a pull-out basis. One professor commented that in most classrooms the Reading/Writing Immersion was not being implemented as a pull-out program.

The university professors were asked how many of the identified children they expected the teacher to be working with a one time. Both said that the teacher should be working with all of the children at one time. The instructional strategies that they had been shown were small group strategies, not one-to-one strategies. The professors had the expectation that the teachers

would work with small groups and incorporate the strategies into the larger group. When the teacher is working with identified students, the rest of the class is expected to be gainfully engaged.

Both professors felt that all of the identified students had improved. They said they had observed a lot of positive growth in the students. For example, children who had no reading skills are now reading, and children who were only drawing pictures are now writing using invented spelling.

Problems/Concerns

The university members were asked to comment on any problems or obstacles they had encountered with the program, and what had been the most difficult aspects of implementing the project; to comment about the selection process for the schools; and finally, what advice to give to anyone initiating a similar project.

The problems mentioned by the professors included the overwhelming time commitment required of the teachers, bureaucratic problems with ordering materials, problems with classroom management and with teacher attitudes. One professor felt that the time commitment required of the teachers hindered the implementation process somewhat. With all the demands on teachers' time they were not able to devote as much time as they would have liked to the Reading/Writing Immersion program.

The professors also felt there was a need for teachers to change attitudes; i.e., some teachers have to increase their expectations for the children. The professors stated that some teachers are concerned about all the extra factors in the child's life and lower their expectations for that child. Another worry of the professors was their perception that teachers feel they

can't run the program by themselves. The teachers think that it must be a pull-out program because they have classroom control problems.

Finally, one professor was somewhat satisfied, and the other was somewhat dissatisfied with the process that was used to select and identify the schools and teachers. The professors felt there was a problem with the selection of the teachers. Some teachers who initially were involved and interested in the project did not stay with the project and were replaced. As well, the university members felt that a couple of the teachers felt at-risk all the time because they were too new.

The advice they would give to anyone beginning a similar project would be:

1. University staff need to spend time in the classrooms before the project begins to develop a better understanding of the schools and their staff. It would also give the teachers a chance to get to know the professors.
2. Make sure it is a volunteer situation for the teachers and that everyone has a clear understanding of what is expected in the project.
3. Have the principals more involved.
4. Have the decisions about the project made sooner.
5. The teachers in the project should have an opportunity to work with other grade 1 teachers in their school as they are going through the program.

Summary

Overall, the comments from the university members about the Reading/Writing Immersion project were positive. They felt the teachers were making a satisfactory effort towards implementing the program; and that on the whole, the project was going along as expected. One point the

professors made was they felt the principals could be more involved in the project by spending more time with the teachers, and more time in the classrooms.

Both university members said they had observed positive changes in the classroom. The teachers and the students had demonstrated a great deal of positive growth. Teachers were using the instructional strategies, and children were beginning to read and write, or were improving their reading and writing skills.

The university members' expectation was that the Reading/Writing Immersion project would not be a pull-out remedial program. The main concern they had with the project was that they felt a few teachers perceived that the only way to be successful with the identified children was to work one-to one with the child outside the context of the classroom. The professors felt that a few teachers needed to raise their expectations of the children and improve their classroom management skills.

Overview of the Ethnographic Field Notes

The purpose of the field notes was to record project events, and participant emotions, reactions and interactions during all phases of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project. Since the individual taking the field notes was an active member (participant observer), a unique view of the project was obtained. One that would have otherwise been lost. The participant observer was able to record events as they occurred, rather than relying on the recall abilities of the participants on a survey. One of the

dangers related to this method, however, is that the researcher may see things from a biased perspective (Borg and Gall, 1989).

As indicated in the introduction, the decision to take field notes at every second meeting was not due to a methodological issue, but rather to a timing problem. When possible, however, the field notes where taken on a more frequent bases. Even with the noted restriction of observation opportunities, at the time of this report, 79 pages of typed data had been collected. Therefore, due to the immense amount of data to be analyzed, only a partial analysis was carried out. For similar reasons, only a summary of the data analyses performed will be provided.

The beginning stage

The initial phase of the project started in September, 1989, and consisted primarily of study group sessions. Those sessions were held at the university and initially were very formal in nature. It seemed as if the participants assumed study group meetings would be similar to typical university lectures. As a result,they seemed to be searching for structure and it was difficult to avoid providing what they wanted.

Also, at that time university staff assumed that the participating teachers knew and understood what the project was about. It quickly became clear that there was much confusion among group members. They spent a lot of time in the first three or four meetings attempting to gain an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. A few of them made it clear that they had not "volunteered" for the project, but were there because they had been made to feel they were "required" to be part of the project.

In order to reconcile the differing perceptions of the project held by various group members, the project proposal was reviewed. The fact that the project was designed to be collaborative in nature was stressed and guidelines for joint decision making were developed. The concept of teachers as decision makers was emphasized.

It was also pointed out that the project was not one which categorized students as problems and extracted them from the classroom for remediation. The fact that this was a classroom based program designed to improve the reading and writing performance of not only targeted students, but of all students was accentuated. This seemed to be a time when all project participants were developing new understandings about the project or were rethinking ones they already held.

During the first meetings individuals from the same schools tended to sit together. Before and after these meetings the participating teachers spoke informally with each other, but during sessions continued to maintain the seating by school arrangement. As the project progressed a common bond seemed to develop and they slowly became a unified group. However, the process was not completed until December, 1989. By December a more random seating order started to occur. During January study group meetings, random order seating arrangements became the most common type of seating.

As previously noted, at the onset of the project it was evident that the teachers were looking to the university staff to lead the group and to lecture to them, even though the proposal described the project as collaborative in nature. On many occasions during the first two months, when the university staff stopped talking, the rest of the group fell silent. Usually, the university staff did not fill these voids. Instead, their actions suggested they were

attempting to get the teachers to accept joint responsibility for the project. During this phase of the project, the university staff often remarked that this was a collaborative project and not a university course. These remarks were more obvious attempts at establishing the "teacher as decision maker" role within the group.

During the first three months of the project, it was apparent that there was a of lack of risk taking on the part of the teachers. For example, at that time the teachers were asked to think about how they would identify students who were encountering difficulties and to begin collecting some student performance data. They were asked to share their ideas and the data they collected at the next study group session. Also, it was suggested that as part of the learning other group members would provide feedback regarding their efforts. Student performance data was collected, however, teacher behaviors in the next session indicated that they were reluctant to share that information with other group members. As a result, the university staff asked for volunteers to present the data they had collected. The teachers reluctantly agreed to this. However, they tended to maintain control over the material by talking about it, but <u>not</u> passing it around the group. In addition, the information presented was limited and general in nature. The university staff did considerable probing in order to get the discussion flowing. Also, when teachers from one school spoke, the teachers from the other schools remained silent.

Another indication of limited risk taking was the silence that met initial attempts at collaborative session planning. During the first few study group sessions, when asked for suggestions, ideas and opinions the typical teacher response was silence.

Finally, initially here was a great deal of concern about the use of the half-time teachers. The teachers were troubled by the fact that during the the second and third stages of the project, they would be away from their classrooms often. They worried about the effect this would have on their students, and what parent reaction would be to these absences.

The middle stage

By the end of October, 1990, the teachers had started to take joint ownership in the project. They began to make suggestions regarding meeting agendas, discussion topics, and establishing timelines for critical project goals and objectives. In fact, during the last meeting in October, the teachers met as a group, without Gerry and Gary present, and discussed how they felt about the project. They also met independently and decided what they wanted to cover in future study group sessions. They were beginning to act as independent decision makers and a unified group.

During the months of December and January, the amount of risk taking increased dramatically. Discussions were free flowing and all members were actively participating. When teachers/schools presented information it was passed around for all to inspect and the teachers were asking most of the questions. In fact, in some cases the teachers were interrupting the university staff in order to ask questions or to direct the discussion in a different direction. By this point in time, when silence occurred, it generally signaled that the topic under discussion had been exhausted.

During this period, study group discussions indicated the teachers were trying a number of the strategies suggested by either university staff or other group members. Also, as the date for classroom observations approached, a

new set of issues arose. These issues focused on the who, what, when, where and whys of the observations. Once again, the teachers expressed uncertainty about the function of the half-time teachers and concern about being away from their classes for any length of time. Questions were also asked about how they were going to work with their five chosen R/WI students.

Finally, it was at this time that the teachers began asking for the theories supporting the strategies and materials suggested for classroom use. They also were experimenting with new student data collection procedures and testing various ways to collate and analyze that data. The first steps were being taken to identifying the students they would work with.

The observation stage

This stage covered the months of February through April, 1990. During this stage the emphasis was on actually working with the R/WI students and the group observations. For group observation purposes the teachers visited each other's classroom twice. These sessions took place in the mornings, and the group met back at the university in the afternoons.

The first round of observations went very well. The group sat quietly during the observation periods and did not interact with the students in the classrooms. The students, with a few minor exceptions, ignored the visitors and just went on with their work. In the debriefing sessions afterwards, there were many discussions regarding the classroom strategies observed, and suggestions were made. These suggestions were always made in a positive light. That is, initial discussion focused on the positive aspects of the instruction and student performance, then suggestions were made that the teacher might want to consider trying. During these sessions, the teachers

being observed also asked questions of the observers. On a number of occasions, the teachers being observed asked for assistance with strategies/techniques they felt they were not having success with. Often they seemed to be seeking confirmation of their own opinions. At this point there was a great deal of risk taking going on within the group.

The second round of observations, however, did not appear to go as well as the first round. During these observations, observers frequently became actively involved with the students and there was a great deal of talking among group members. Discussions following these observations periods were frequently off-topic. The teacher often got into side discussions during the formal part of the meeting. There appeared to be boredom with the second round of observations.

The focus of the afternoon sessions began to slowly shift during the last two months. Concerns now appeared to focus more on the effects of the program on the students and what was going to happen next year. Even though one of the goals of the project was to work with students within the classroom setting, participants from two of the four schools expressed a strong concern that the project would not work unless "extra staff" were provided and the students were tutored on a "one-on-one" basis. In fact, individuals from these two schools attributed this year's successes to the participation of the half-time teachers. The university staff reaffirmed that there would be no extra money available for hiring additional staff. However, these individuals remained convinced that a one-to-one relationship was necessary for student progress.

Another issue during this time period was that the final reports had to be written. The objective of the school reports is to provide: (a) information

on the progress of the students who took part in the project; (b) a plan for the continuation and explanation of the project in year two; and, (c) participant reflections of the project. The teachers expressed concern about what they should include in the report, the structure of the report, and who would read the reports.

The same individuals who were convinced of the need for one-to-one programming expressed the desire to retain certain students. The university staff were concerned that the teachers were unaware of the research regarding the effects of retention on students. As a result of this initial discussion, the group decided to collect related journal articles, and one study group session was spent discussing the merits and drawbacks of retaining students.

A final issue of concern was that of student follow-up. The teachers were worried about the future progress of this year's students and it seemed they thought that they might somehow enhance this progress by collecting follow-up data. When informed that the project did not provide for collecting follow-up data on first year students, the teachers wrote a proposal to Inner City Initiative requesting funds for that purpose. The university staff supported the proposal and indicated they would be willing to supply some technical support, but that the teachers themselves would carry it out.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the process evaluation, it was concluded that, while there were some minor problems in the project, overall the project was a success. The comments of the participating teachers, university staff and

administrators were generally positive. Their comments indicated that: (a) the project provided them with useful information, (b) for the most part they were certain that changes had been made, (c) the changes were of a permanent nature, (d) the students selected for the project benefited from it, and (e) other students in each class also benefited. While the perception of student benefits was reported these findings should be confirmed next year by an outcome evaluation.

Participants also reported that they played a collaborative role in the project. That is, they stated that they were able to suggest items for meeting agendas and materials/readings for discussion. Finally, the participating teachers were, for the most part, happy with the amount of support they received from university staff, school administrators and Inner City Initiative personnel.

There are, however, some concerns that need to be addressed. The critical concerns expressed by the participants (teachers and university staff) were:

1. that too much information in the form of materials/readings were presented;
2. that the materials/readings were covered too rapidly;
3. that follow-up of the materials by the university staff was inadequate;
4. that there appeared to be an unmet expectation for more concrete suggestions for the classroom;
5. that the university staff did not fully empathize with participants regarding the problems they experience in the classroom;
6. that participants put far more time into the project than they had expected;

7. that they were spending too much time away from their students;

8. that the project would not work unless "extra staff" were provided and the students were tutored on a "one-on-one" basis;

9. that they did not "volunteer" for the project and were not fully aware of the goals and objectives of the project;

10. that the teachers were unaware of the research regarding the effects of retention on students;

11. that contrary to survey responses, ethnographic data indicated that the second round of group observations seemed to cause boredom;

12. that some teachers were so concern about outside factors in the child's life that they had lowered expectations for student performance; and

13. that project approval was so delayed that university staff were unable to make adjustments in their workloads.

Recommendations

Based on an analysis of the information collected, the following recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that the decision process for initiating projects such as this one be conducted more efficiently. For example, due to the delayed funding of the project, the university staff paid a number of project bills out of their own pockets. This would have lead to serious consequences if the project had not been funded. In addition, the late approval of the project funding resulted in: (a) the delay in the collection of baseline data; (b) preventing university staff from adjusting their teaching schedules:; and (c) the cancelation of a pre-program introduction for project participants.

2. Based on our experiences, we recommend that project facilitators (i.e., university staff) be involved in the selection of project participants. This would have been more in keeping with the collaborative nature of the project and would have allowed division personnel to make a more informed decision regarding their involvement. Ethnographic data indicated that two of the participants did not believe that a classroom based approach would work. Rather, they felt that in order to have a positive effect on at-risk students, it is necessary that they be worked with on a one-to-one basis. This is in direct contradiction of the project's philosophy. Attitudes of this sort may have adversely affected the project's outcomes.

3. It is recommended that the teachers be free to opt in or out of projects such as R/WI. Comments by some teachers made it clear they felt they had no choice but to take part in the project, and resented that fact. This resentment likely had a negative effect on some aspects the project.

4. It is recommended that R/WI participants be allowed to opt out of the second year of the project if they so desire.

5. It is recommended that the classroom observation period begin earlier in the program and that a space between the first and second round of observations be added in order to prevent the participants from becoming bored.

6. It is recommended that the university staff review the amount of material that was presented to project participants, as they complained that too much material was presented too fast.

7. Based on the ethnographic data, it is recommended that the principals play a more active part within the R/WI project. One possible way for them to do this is for each school to establish a management team structure within the school. This would allow for the principal to assume a visible role within the project and might could provide an opportunity for additional school staff to become involved in the project.

8. Again, from the ethnographic data, it is recommended that the purchasing of materials be made easier for the schools. School staff reported that division procedures delayed the ordering and receiving of materials. This often interfered with the smooth running of the project. That is, experimentation with new teaching techniques were sometimes delayed for a month due to the inability to order and receive materials quickly.

In conclusion, this past year has been a positive one for both the teacher participants and the university participants. It has allowed for the two groups to come together and work collaboratively in an attempt to experiment with alternative approaches to teaching at-risk students. This project not only allowed the teachers an opportunity for professional growth, but had a similar impact on the university staff. Spending time in classrooms and communicating with teachers and students gave university staff the chance to link their instructional concepts and actions to actual student and

teacher performance. It is our impression that this resulted in improved decision making at both the university and public school levels. Through this project all participants gained an understanding that there is no one best way to improve instruction or teach all students. It became evident that effective teachers are those who tend to view an instructional plan as an hypothesis or informed prediction, and are willing and able to change how they teach.

REFERENCES

Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction. Longman: New York.

Jacob, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: A review. Review of Educational Research, 57(1), 1-50.

Madak, P.R., Bravi, G. and Kilarr, G. (February, 1990). Teacher and Administrator Survey Results: Interim Report #2. Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba.

APPENDIX A

FIRST TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS FOR OCTOBER 19, 1989

One of the conditions of the funding for this project is that it be evaluated. The purpose of this survey is to collect information from the participants of the project in order to provide evaluative information to the funder and also to provide information that will assist in making improvements, if needed, to the project. As previously discussed with you, **all responses will be kept completely confidential! Therefore, do not include your name anywhere on this survey!**

Please complete and return this survey in the envelop provided. The surveys will be read and scored by the assigned research assistant. We will only see the compiled data and not the individual forms that you complete. After the data has been compiled, it will be shared with you at one of our meetings.

Please read each question carefully. For each question, find the response which best represents you opinion and circle it. If you need more space for writing in comments/suggestions, use the back of the page. If you have any questions concerning the survey, we will be more than happy to answer them. We would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to assist us in the very important task of evaluating the Reading/Writing Immersion Project.

1. Do you feel that you are aware of all of the goals and objectives of this program?

   3 (42.9%) 1.) yes.
   4 (57.1%) 2.) no.

   Comments/suggestions.

   - **I get a sense of other objectives (1 participant).**
   - **Goal/objectives may change with time (1 participant).**

I. MEETINGS

2. The meeting for the Reading/Writing Immersion Program have been held in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. How do you feel about this location?

4 (57.1%) 1.) the location is fine.
2 (28.6%) 2.) the location is too far from my home school.
1 (14.3%) 3.) it does not matter to me where the meetings are held.

3. Rate the room in which the meetings have been held in by circling the most appropriate response.

	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
a.) room is clean	57.1%	42.9&	0%	0%
b.) room is well lighted	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	0%
c.) size of the room is adequate	42.9%	57.1%	0%	0%
d.) temperature of room is comfortable	14.3%	0%	14.3%	71.4%

4. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall organization of the meetings held so far?

0 (0.0%) 1.) meetings have been very well organized.
7 (100%) 2.) meetings have been well organized.
0 (0.0%) 3.) meetings have been poorly organized.
0 (0.0%) 4.) meetings have been very poorly organized.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Time for more structure (1 participant).**

5. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the agendas of the meetings?

4 (57.1%) 1.) very satisfied.
3 (42.9%) 2.) somewhat satisfied.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat dissatisfied.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all satisfied.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

No comments/suggestions made.

6. When you have made suggestions with regards to the meeting agendas, did you feel that your suggestions were given adequate consideration?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very adequate consideration.
3 (42.9%) 2.) adequate consideration.
1 (14.3%) 3.) were considered, but not adequately.
0 (0.0%) 4.) were not considered at all.

Comments/suggestions.

- **It really made the idea of collaboration true (1 participant).**

II. MATERIALS/READINGS

7. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the materials/readings that have been provided to you?

2 (28.6%) 1.) very high quality.
5 (71.4%) 2.) high quality.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor quality.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor quality.

Comments/suggestions.

- **More sharing of materials as this is the best way of assessing materials (1 participant).**
- **Without the tapes referred to in the text, I am at a bit of a loss (1 participant).**
- **Too many readings per week (1 participant).**

8. Do you feel that the materials/readings provided to you thus far has presented:

2 (28.6%) 1.) mostly new information.
5 (71.4%) 2.) a half-and-half mixture of new and old information.
0 (0.0%) 3.) mostly old information that I already knew.

9. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of the materials/readings provided to you?

5 (71.4%) 1.) very useful.
2 (28.6%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Not all materials provided have been of immediate use, but will be used later (1 participant).**
- **Applying ideas for the readings (1 participant).**

10. How would you rate the amount of information that has been provided to you?

2 (28.6%) 1.) far too much material.
4 (57.1%) 2.) just a little too much material to be read in one week.
1 (14.3%) 3.) the right amount.
0 (0.0%) 4.) could have dealt with a little more material each week.
0 (0.0%) 5.) far too little in the way of materials/readings were provided.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Getting behind (2 participants).**
- **Designate participants to read certain materials, then verbally report back (1 participant).**
- **Not interested in everything given (1 participant).**

11. How adequate was the university staff follow-up to the materials/readings (i.e., willingness to discuss/explain ideas presented in the materials/readings)?

1 (14.3%) 1.) very adequate.
5 (71.4%) 2.) adequate.
1 (14.3%) 3.) somewhat adequate.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all adequate.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Too much material for university staff to follow up on (2 participants).**
- **University staff questioned more than discussed or explained (1 participant).**
- **People on the project should ask for the discussion of all articles (1 participant).**

12. Do you feel that the materials/readings given to you covered the topic areas that you thought would be covered when you started the program?

4 (57.1%) 1.) yes, very few surprises.
3 (42.9%) 2.) yes, but there were a number of areas I did not expect to be covered.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, there were a lot of areas covered that I did not expect.

13. Were there topic areas you would have liked to have received materials/readings on, but did not?

2 (28.6%) 1.) yes.
5 (71.4%) 2.) no.

If yes, what were those topic areas?

- **Understanding writing (1 participant).**
- **Invented spelling (1 participant).**

14. Given that this is a collaborative project, did you feel that you could suggest materials/readings for the group?

7 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

Comments/suggestions

- **Don't know of any at present (1 participant).**

15. In your opinion, how would you rate the pace at which the material/readings have been presented?

5 (71.4%) 1.) the pace has been very fast.
2 (28.6%) 2.) the pace has been fast, but not unreasonable.
0 (0.0%) 3.) the pace has been just right.
0 (0.0%) 4.) the pace has been slow.
0 (0.0%) 5.) the pace has been very slow.

Comments/suggestions.

- **This is only true of some weeks and when the pace was slowed (1 participant).**
- **After teaching all day and rushing out here it's hard to digest a lot of new material (1 participant).**

III. PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

16. At this point in the project, is the project:

2 (28.6%) 1.) exactly what you thought it would be.
4 (57.1%) 2.) very close to what you thought it would be.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat close to what you thought it would be.
1 (14.3%) 4.) not at all what you thought it to be.

If not what you thought, how is it different?

- **Thought we would have received more concrete ideas of what to do with specific kids (2 participants).**
- **I get the sense that my expectations are not always university staff expectations (1 participant).**
- **Did not realize that I would be providing explanation on how to teach inner city students (1 participant).**

17. Are the topic areas that have been covered to this date, the topic area that you thought would be covered?

5 (71.4%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

In no, how is it different?

- **I felt strategies and material selection could also be covered by now (1 participant).**
- **Thought 'how tos' would be more specific (1 participant).**

18. Is the project turning out to be as useful to you as you thought it would be?

3 (42.9%) 1.) yes, very useful.
4 (57.1%) 2.) yes, somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) no, not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

- **I expect usefulness will increase as time goes on (1 participant).**
- **With more structure coming, I will find it more useful (1 participant).**
- **Not all schools are doing things at the same time, therefore I find it difficult to compare ideas, techniques (1 participant).**

19. List the three most important things that you thought you would get out of the project.

- **Effective teaching strategies in reading and writing (7 participants).**
- **Communication. Talk with other teachers (2 participants).**
- **Chance to set up a really good lit. based program (2 participants).**

At this point in the project, how confident are you that the above three expectations will be reached?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very confident.
4 (57.1%) 2.) somewhat confident.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very confident.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all confident.

Why or why not?

- **Much of what is discussed/read each week is applicable to me (1 participant).**
- **Don't know if I'm doing the right thing (1 participant).**
- **The teachers are willing to share, discuss and assess together (1 participant).**

IV.SUPPORT FOR THE PROJECT

20. In your opinion, how would you rate the university members of the group in the areas listed below?

		Always	Sometimes	Never
a.)	they are approachable	100%	0%	0%
b.)	they value my opinions	85.7%	14.3%	0%
c.)	they treated me as a professional	100%	0%	0%
d.)	they were willing to answer all my questions	100%	0%	0%
e.)	they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the classroom	28.6%	71.4%	0%
f.)	they suggest rather than dictate or criticize	85.7%	14.3%	0%
g.)	they actively look for and encourage my input	85.7%	14.3%	0%
h.)	they help me feel more confident about what I do in the classroom	28.6%	57.1%	0%
i.)	they make suggestions that are useful to me	28.6%	57.1%	0%
j.)	they try to make the project challenging	85.7%	14.3%	0%

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

No responses made.

21. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?

0 (0.0%) 1.) very good.
4 (57.1%) 2.) good.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvement..

- **More clarification as to expectations (1 participant).**
- **Erika has visited my school and my class (1 participant).**
- **Too soon to comment (1 participant).**

22. In your opinion, how would you rate the support being provided to this program from your school's administrator(s)?

2 (28.6%) 1.) very good.
4 (57.1%) 2.) good.
1 (14.3%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

- **More talk time (1 participant).**
- **Need more understanding of program's objectives (1 participant).**
- **They are unclear as why classroom teacher is excluded from management (1 participant).**

V. PROGRAM USEFULNESS AND FINAL COMMENTS

23. Given that the program has just begun, how would your rate the following items?

a.) I find that the information presented so far has been:

4 (57.1%)	1.) very useful.
3 (42.9%)	2.) useful.
0 (0.0%)	3.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%)	4.) not at all useful.

b.) I find that I am already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in my classroom.

6 (85.7%)	1.) yes.
0 (0.0%)	2.) no.

c.) I find that I have already adopted some of the ideas/techniques as part of what I do in my classroom.

5 (71.4%)	1.) yes.
1 (14.3%)	2.) no.

d.) Based on your experiences thus far, what do you feel is the probability that you will make changes to what you do in the classroom?

5 (71.4%)	1.) I am 100% certain I will make changes.
1 (14.3%)	2.) I am 85% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%)	3.) I am 50% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%)	4.) I am 25% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%)	5.) I am 100% certain that I will not make changes.

Comments.

- **I used some of these ideas/techniques before the program (2 participants).**
- **I will always be making changes (1 participant).**

24. If you could change one thing about the program, what would it be?

- **More research data (1 participant).**
- **More specific as to plans and goals (1 participant).**
- **University staff need to say more - be more a part of the discussions (1 participant).**

25. At this point in time, do you have any suggestions that you have not already made earlier in this survey for improving the Reading/Writing Immersion Project? If so, what are they?

- **Higher component of professional development (1 participant).**
- **Share lists of good children's literature (1 participant).**
- **More individual attention in the classroom (1 participant).**

26. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

- **I feel that the implications are constant (1 participant).**
- **This project has been positively forcing me to develop myself in the areas of reading and writing (1 participant).**
- **Sometimes there is a clique (1 participant).**

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B

SECOND TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

SECOND TEACHER SURVEY

JANUARY 17, 1990

One of the conditions of the funding for this project is that it be evaluated. The purpose of this survey is to collect information from the participants of the project in order to provide evaluative information to the funder and also to provide information that will assist in making improvements, if needed, to the project. As previously discussed with you, **all responses will be kept completely confidential! Therefore, do not include your name anywhere on this survey!**

Please complete and return this survey in the envelop provided. The surveys will be read and scored by the assigned research assistant. We will only see the compiled data and not the individual forms that you complete. After the data has been compiled, it will be shared with you at one of our meetings.

Please read each question carefully. **Since this is the second questionnaire, your answers should be based on the events that have occurred since the first survey. Do not base your answers on events that took place before the first survey!** For each question, find the response which best represents you opinion and circle it. If you need more space for writing in comments/suggestions, use the back of the page. If you have any questions concerning the survey, we will be more than happy to answer them. We would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to assist us in the very important task of evaluating the Reading/Writing Immersion Project.

1. Do you feel that you are aware of all of the goals and objectives of this program?

   6 (85.7%) 1.) yes.
   1 (14.3%) 2.) no.

   Comments/suggestions.

   - **My students, their parents, the school and I did not expect that someone else could/would take over the L.A. program after Christmas (i.e., the 1/2 time teacher). (1 participant)**

I. MEETINGS

2. Rate the room in which the meetings have been held in by circling the most appropriate response.

		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
a.)	room is clean	**57.1%**	**42.9%**	**0%**	**0%**
b.)	room is well lighted	**57.1%**	**42.9%**	**0%**	**0%**
c.)	size of the room is adequate	**71.4%**	**14.3%**	**14.3%**	**0%**
d.)	temperature of room is comfortable	**28.6%**	**14.3%**	**42.9%**	**14.3%**

3. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall organization of the meetings held so far?

0 (0.0%) 1.) meetings have been very well organized.
7 (100%) 2.) meetings have been well organized.
0 (0.0%) 3.) meetings have been poorly organized.
0 (0.0%) 4.) meetings have been very poorly organized.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Reduce the amount of wasted time, i.e., late people/room shuffles (2 participants).**
- **Discourage/stop conversations during survey time - today was disgusting (1 participant).**
- **Discourage early exits (1 participant).**

4. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the agendas of the meetings?

2 (28.6%) 1.) very satisfied.
5 (71.4%) 2.) somewhat satisfied.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat dissatisfied.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all satisfied.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

- **I feel I can make suggestions and then see those suggestions addressed at the next meeting (1 participant).**

5. When you have made suggestions with regards to the meeting agendas, did you feel that your suggestions were given adequate consideration?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very adequate consideration.
4 (57.1%) 2.) adequate consideration.
0 (0.0%) 3.) were considered, but not adequately.
0 (0.0%) 4.) were not considered at all.

Comments/suggestions.

No comments/suggestions made.

II. MATERIALS/READINGS

6. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the materials/readings that have been provided to you?

2 (28.6%) 1.) very high quality.
5 (71.4%) 2.) high quality.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor quality.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor quality.

Comments/suggestions.

No comments/suggestions made.

7. Do you feel that the materials/readings provided to you thus far has presented:

2 (28.6%) 1.) mostly new information.
5 (71.4%) 2.) a half-and-half mixture of new and old information.
0 (0.0%) 3.) mostly old information that I already knew.

8. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of the materials/readings provided to you?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very useful.
4 (57.1%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **On December 7, we were given several phonics articles based on another (1st.) article. I checked my handouts and don't think we ever had the 1st. article (1 participant).**

9. How would you rate the amount of information that has been provided to you?

2 (28.6%) 1.) far too much material.
2 (28.6%) 2.) just a little too much material to be read in one week.
3 (42.9%) 3.) the right amount.
0 (0.0%) 4.) could have dealt with a little more material each week.
0 (0.0%) 5.) far too little in the way of materials/readings were provided.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Some weeks are more hectic at school. Too much when combined with much reading (1 participant).**

10. How adequate was the university staff follow-up to the materials/readings (i.e., willingness to discuss/explain ideas presented in the materials/readings)?

1 (14.3%) 1.) very adequate.
2 (28.6%) 2.) adequate.
3 (42.9%) 3.) somewhat adequate.
1 (14.3%) 4.) not at all adequate.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Tended to move too quickly (2 participants).**

- **I would like to see more time spent on this (1 participant).**

- **Although intended to return to material - did not (1 participant).**

11. Do you feel that the materials/readings given to you covered the topic areas that you thought would be covered when you started the program?

3 (42.9%) 1.) yes, very few surprises.
4 (57.1%) 2.) yes, but there were a number of areas I did not expect to be covered.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, there were a lot of areas covered that I did not expect.

12. Were there topic areas you would have liked to have received materials/readings on, but did not?

2 (28.6%) 1.) yes.
4 (57.1%) 2.) no.

If yes, what were those topic areas?

- **Invented spelling (1 participant).**

- **Reading and writing instructional strategies (1 participant)**

13. Given that this is a collaborative project, did you feel that you could suggest materials/readings for the group?

7 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

Comments/suggestions

No comments/suggestions made.

14. In your opinion, how would you rate the pace at which the material/readings have been presented?

4 (57.1%) 1.) the pace has been very fast.
1 (14.3%) 2.) the pace has been fast, but not unreasonable.
1 (14.3%) 3.) the pace has been just right.
1 (14.3%) 4.) the pace has been slow.
0 (0.0%) 5.) the pace has been very slow.

Comments/suggestions.

- **Pace is either fast or slow and boring (1 participant).**

15. How useful was it to have the two book displays as part of our sessions?

5 (71.4%) 1.) very useful.
2 (28.6%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions.

- **Nov. 30th was great - many books and lots of time to look (1 participant).**
- **Great opportunity to discuss specific books with project members (1 participant).**

III. SCHOOL VISITS

16. How helpful were observations/suggestions made during the school visits in focusing the intent of the program?

1 (14.3%) 1.) very useful.
4 (57.1%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Sometimes I found the observer too critical (1 participant).**
- **Observer could observe the behavior of 1 or 2 kids that I cannot see while teaching the whole class (1 participant).**
- **I was not observed (1 participant).**

17. How helpful were the school visits in assisting you to make connections between the material/content presented in the sessions at the university and what you do with kids?

1 (14.3%) 1.) very useful.
4 (57.1%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **I was not observed (1 participant).**

18. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add about the school visits?

- **I am finding the school visits very helpful - advice is practical (2 participants).**
- **Profs try to come when the teacher wants them (1 participant).**
- **Visits need a meeting away from distractions (1 participant).**

IV. PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

19. At this point in the project, is the project:

2 (28.6%) 1.) exactly what you thought it would be.
5 (71.4%) 2.) very close to what you thought it would be.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat close to what you thought it would be.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all what you thought it to be.

If not what you thought, how is it different?

- **I thought it would be more directed until I found out by questioning that it was supposed to be unstructured (1 participant).**

20. Are the topic areas that have been covered since the last survey, the topic area that you thought would be covered?

7 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

In no, how is it different?

No comments/suggestions made.

21. Is the project turning out to be as useful to you as you thought it would be?

3 (42.9%) 1.) yes, very useful.
4 (57.1%) 2.) yes, somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) no, not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

No comments/suggestions made.

22. At this point, how confident are you that your expectations for the project will be reached?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very confident.
4 (57.1%) 2.) somewhat confident.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very confident.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all confident.

Why or why not?

- **We seem to be moving in the right direction (1 participant).**

23. Going back to September, was the time you have put into the project:

5 (71.4%) 1.) much more than you expected
1 (14.3%) 2.) a bit more than you expected
0 (0.0%) 3.) just what you expected
0 (0.0%) 4.) a bit less than you expected
1 (14.3%) 5.) a lot less than you expected

Do you have any additional comment/concerns/suggestions to make regarding the amount of time taken up by this project?

- **I am away from my class too much (1 participant).**
- **I need more prep time due to these Tues. meetings (1 participant).**
- **I worked long and hard on the write-up for this project in order to meet the Dec. 7 deadline (1 participant).**

24. If you had the choice, would you want to be able to receive university course credit for this project?

6 (85.7%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.
1 (14.3%) 3.) undecided

V. SUPPORT FOR THE PROJECT

25. In your opinion, how would you rate the university members of the group in the areas listed below?

	Always	Sometimes	Never
a.) they are approachable	100%	0%	0%
b.) they value my opinions	85.7%	14.3%	0%
c.) they treated me as a professional	57.1%	42.9%	0%
d.) they were willing to answer all my questions	71.4%	14.3%	0%
e.) they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the classroom	42.9%	57.1%	0%
f.) they suggest rather than dictate or criticize	85.7%	14.3%	0%
g.) they actively look for and encourage my input	85.7%	14.3%	0%
h.) they help me feel more confident about what I do in the classroom	28.6%	57.1%	0%
i.) they make suggestions that are useful to me	42.9%	57.1%	0%
j.) they try to make the project challenging	85.7%	14.3%	0%

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

No comments/suggestions made.

26. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?

3 (42.9%) 1.) very good.
3 (42.9%) 2.) good.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvement..

- **Erika visited once (1 participant).**

27. In your opinion, how would you rate the support being provided to this program from your school's administrator(s)?

1 (14.3%) 1.) very good.
6 (85.7%) 2.) good.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

No comments/suggestions made.

VI.PROGRAM USEFULNESS AND FINAL COMMENTS

28. Given that this is the approximate midpoint in first year of the project, how would your rate the following items?

a.) I find that the information presented so far has been:

4 (57.1%) 1.) very useful.
3 (42.9%) 2.) useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

b.) I find that I am already trying out some of the ideas/techniques in my classroom.

6 (85.7%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

c.) I find that I have already adopted some of the ideas/techniques as part of what I do in my classroom.

7 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

d.) Based on your experiences thus far, what do you feel is the probability that you will make changes to what you do in the classroom?

3 (42.9%) 1.) I am 100% certain I will make changes.
4 (57.1%) 2.) I am 85% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%) 3.) I am 50% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%) 4.) I am 25% certain I will make changes.
0 (0.0%) 5.) I am 100% certain that I will not make changes.

Comments.

- **Project has helped make it easier to present a rationale for what happens in the classroom (1 participant).**

29. Given the events between the first survey and now, if you could change one thing about the program, what would it be?

- **Expectations on all sides could have been expressed and discussed more fully (1 participant).**
- **More time spent on book studies (1 participant).**

30. Given what has taken place between the first survey and now, do you have any suggestions that you have not already made earlier in this survey for improving the Reading/Writing Immersion Project? If so, what are they?

- **If we needed a text from this bookstore, let us go and buy it when we're out here - I didn't appreciate coming back here for a 2 min. purchase (1 participant).**

- **If we are going to do something on the following Tues. - everyone should be sure they know about it (1 participant).**

31. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

- **I have reservations about organizations and record keeping (1 participant).**
- **It's great - it is beginning to all come together (1 participant).**

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX C

THIRD TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

THIRD TEACHER SURVEY

MARCH 21, 1990

One of the conditions of the funding for this project is that it be evaluated. The purpose of this survey is to collect information from the participants of the project in order to provide evaluative information to the funder and also to provide information that will assist in making improvements, if needed, to the project. As previously discussed with you, **all responses will be kept completely confidential! Therefore, do not include your name anywhere on this survey!**

Please complete and return this survey in the envelope provided. The surveys will be read and scored by the assigned research assistant. We will only see the compiled data and not the individual forms that you complete. After the data has been compiled, it will be shared with you at one of our meetings.

Please read each question carefully. **Since this is the third questionnaire, your answers should be based on the events that have occurred after the second survey. Do not base your answers on events that took place before the second survey!** For each question, find the response which best represents your opinion and circle it. If you need more space for writing comments/suggestions, use the back of the page. If you have any questions concerning the survey, we will be more than happy to answer them. We would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to assist us in the very important task of evaluating the Reading/Writing Immersion Project.

I. MEETINGS

1. Rate the room in which the meetings have been held in by circling the most appropriate response.

		Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
a.)	room is clean	**62.5%**	**37.5%**	**0%**	**0%**
b.)	room is well lighted	**50.0%**	**50.0%**	**0%**	**0%**
c.)	size of the room is adequate	**50.0%**	**50.0%**	**0%**	**0%**
d.)	temperature of room is comfortable	**37.5%**	**50.0%**	**12.5%**	**0%**

2. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall organization of the meetings held so far?

1 (12.5%) 1.) meetings have been very well organized.
5 (62.5%) 2.) meetings have been well organized.
1 (12.5%) 3.) meetings have been poorly organized.
0 (0.0%) 4.) meetings have been very poorly organized.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Sometimes it seems that the profs are dragging out discussions to fill the time (2 participants).**
- **We have been told what we were going to do and found that this had changed when we got there (1 participant).**
- **Discuss some topics in large groups and then spend time about specific kids (1 participant).**

3. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the agendas of the meetings?

3 (37.5%) 1.) very satisfied.
4 (50.0%) 2.) somewhat satisfied.
1 (12.5%) 3.) somewhat dissatisfied.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all satisfied.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

- **I feel we are being treated somewhat as students in a course (1 participant).**
- **Sharing of procedure; e.g., reports were given insufficient time (1 participant).**
- **The teachers should have been sharing their reports with each other (1 participant).**

4. When you have made suggestions with regards to the meeting agendas, did you feel that your suggestions were given adequate consideration?

4 (50.0%) 1.) very adequate consideration.
3 (37.5%) 2.) adequate consideration.
1 (12.5%) 3.) were considered, but not adequately.
0 (0.0%) 4.) were not considered at all.

Comments/suggestions.

- **Suggestions were given consideration (1 participant).**
- **More time for discussion to clarify points (1 participant).**

II. MATERIALS/READINGS

5. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the materials/readings that have been provided to you?

5 (62.5%) 1.) very high quality.
3 (37.5%) 2.) high quality.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor quality.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor quality.

Comments/suggestions.

- **The articles are great (1 participant).**
- **It may take six more months to read all of them (1 participant).**

6. Do you feel that the materials/readings provided to you thus far has presented:

0 (0.0%) 1.) mostly new information.
8 (100%) 2.) a half-and-half mixture of new and old information.
0 (0.0%) 3.) mostly old information that I already knew.

7. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of the materials/readings provided to you?

6 (75.0%) 1.) very useful.
2 (25.0%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **I was pleased with the materials/readings provided (1 participant).**
- **This has been a very strong point in the project (1 participant).**

8. How would you rate the amount of information that has been provided to you?

1 (12.5%) 1.) far too much material.
1 (12.5%) 2.) just a little too much material to be read in one week.
5 (62.5%) 3.) the right amount.
0 (0.0%) 4.) could have dealt with a little more material each week.
0 (0.0%) 5.) far too little in the way of materials/readings were provided.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Book studies should continue every week (2 participants).**
- **I tried to do an adequate job [on Calkins], and that took considerable time (1 participant).**
- **Some good handouts were passed out and not discussed (1 participant).**

9. How adequate was the university staff follow-up to the materials/readings (i.e., willingness to discuss/explain ideas presented in the materials/readings)?

1 (12.5%) 1.) very adequate.
5 (62.5%) 2.) adequate.
1 (12.5%) 3.) somewhat adequate.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all adequate.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **We still need time to discuss readings after we have had the opportunity to try or develop what we have read in our classes (2 participants).**

10. Do you feel that the materials/readings given to you covered the topic areas that you thought would be covered when you started the program?

5 (62.5%) 1.) yes, very few surprises.
2 (25.0%) 2.) yes, but there were a number of areas I did not expect to be covered.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, there were a lot of areas covered that I did not expect.

11. Were there topic areas you would have liked to have received materials/readings on, but did not?

3 (37.5%) 1.) yes.
4 (50.0%) 2.) no.

If yes, what were those topic areas?

- **Reading diagnosis (2 participants).**
- **More time on self-monitoring/self-correction (1 participant).**
- **Ideas on the home school connection (1 participant).**

12. Given that this is a collaborative project, did you feel that you could suggest materials/readings for the group?

8 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

Comments/suggestions

NO RESPONSES MADE.

13. In your opinion, how would you rate the pace at which the material/readings have been presented?

3 (37.5%) 1.) the pace has been very fast.
2 (25.0%) 2.) the pace has been fast, but not unreasonable.
3 (37.5%) 3.) the pace has been just right.
0 (0.0%) 4.) the pace has been slow.
0 (0.0%) 5.) the pace has been very slow.

Comments/suggestions.

- **The Calkins book was heavy (1 participant).**
- **I would have preferred to spend more time on less material (1 participant).**
- **Pace has been adjusted (1 participant).**

II. **SCHOOL VISITS (When Gerry/Gary visited your school on their own.)**

14. How helpful were the observations/suggestions made during the school visits in focusing the intent of the program?

5 (62.5%) 1.) very useful.
3 (37.5%) 2.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **More school visits (1 participant).**
- **Don't have profs drag out discussions (1 participant).**
- **It would be great if Gerry and/or Gary could model some reading and writing strategies with the kids (1 participant).**

15. How helpful were the school visits in assisting you to make connections between the material/content presented in the sessions at the university and what you do with kids?

3 (37.5%) 1.) very helpful.
5 (62.5%) 2.) somewhat helpful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very helpful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all helpful.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **I would like more input from the faculty staff (1 participant).**

16. Overall, when comparing all of the components of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project (i.e., sessions at the university and group observations), how important are the school visits made by Gary and Gerry?

2 (25.0%) 1.) the most important component.
5 (62.5%) 2.) equal in importance to the other two components.
1 (12.5%) 3.) not as important as the other two components.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all important.

Comments/suggestions.

- **It is essential that when individual children are discussed, both the professor and the teacher can relate personally (2 participants).**
- **Visits are a link between all the schools/personnel and readings (2 participants).**

17. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add about the school visits?

- **Should be more frequent (2 participants).**
- **He [the prof] is not afraid to become involved with the kids (1 participant).**
- **Group in 2s or 3s to discuss strategies and problems (1 participant).**

III. GROUP OBSERVATIONAL SESSIONS

18. How helpful were the observations/suggestions made to you during the group observational sessions?

2 (25.0%) 1.) very helpful.
6 (75.0%) 2.) somewhat helpful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very helpful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all helpful.

Comments/suggestions.

- **Observations were very good (1 participant).**
- **Wish we had spread them further apart (1 participant).**

19. How helpful were the group observational sessions in assisting you to make connections between the material/content presented in the sessions at the university and what you do with kids?

3 (37.5%) 1.) very helpful.
4 (50.0%) 2.) somewhat helpful.
1 (12.5%) 3.) not very helpful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all helpful.

Comments/suggestions.

- **To see in practice what has been discussed and reported made our meetings more useful (1 participant).**

20. Overall, when comparing all of the components of the Reading/Writing Immersion Project (i.e., sessions at the university and school visits), how important are the group observational sessions?

1 (12.5%) 1.) the most important component.
4 (50.0%) 2.) equal in importance to the other two components.
3 (37.5%) 3.) not as important as the other two components.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all important.

Comments/suggestions.

- **There are too many visits to each school (2 participants).**
- **After hearing about kids and classrooms in other schools, it was great to see the actual situation (1 participant).**
- **Great forum for new ideas and new perspectives (1 participant).**

21. In your opinion, how many group observational sessions should be included in this project?

0 (0.0%) 1.) none.
2 (25.0%) 2.) 1.
3 (37.5%) 3.) 2.
2 (25.0%) 4.) 3.
0 (0.0%) 5.) 4 or more.

22. When do you feel that the group observational sessions should have started?

5 (62.5%) 1.) earlier in the program.
3 (37.5%) 2.) exactly when they did start.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not until latter in the program.

Comments/suggestions.

- **It would have been great to see things as they were in the other schools in November (1 participant).**

23. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add about the group observational sessions?

- **Wish Gerry's timetable would have allowed him to visit other schools with everyone else (1 participant).**
- **The Wednesday afternoon rehash of the morning activities was very boring to those who had been there in the morning [a waste of 30-45 minutes] (1 participant).**

IV.PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

24. At this point in the project, is the project:

2 (25.0%) 1.) exactly what you thought it would be.
4 (50.0%) 2.) very close to what you thought it would be.
2 (25.0%) 3.) somewhat close to what you thought it would be.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all what you thought it to be.

If not what you thought, how is it different?

NO RESPONSES MADE.

25. Are the topic areas that have been covered since the last survey, the topic area that you thought would be covered?

6 (75.0%) 1.) yes.
1 (12.5%) 2.) no.

In no, how is it different?

- **We have never received an actual plan of what topics/books will be covered, so each week was a surprise (1 participant).**

26. Is the project turning out to be as useful to you as you thought it would be?

7 (87.5%) 1.) yes, very useful.
1 (12.5%) 2.) yes, somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, not very useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) no, not at all useful.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

NO RESPONSES MADE.

27. At this point, how confident are your expectations for the project will be reached?

5 (62.5%) 1.) very confident.
3 (37.5%) 2.) somewhat confident.
0 (0.0%) 3.) not very confident.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all confident.

Why or why not?

- **Have been helped so much (2 participants).**
- **I have learned how to use strategies to reach more kids at risk (1 participant).**
- **Have developed ideas to accommodate varying abilities (1 participant).**

V. SUPPORT FOR THE PROJECT

28. In your opinion, how would you rate the university members of the group in the areas listed below?

	Always	Sometimes	Never
a.) they are approachable	75.0%	25.0%	0%
b.) they value my opinions	62.5%	37.5%	0%
c.) they treated me as a professional	75.0%	25.0%	0%
d.) they were willing to answer all my questions	75.0%	25.0%	0%
e.) they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the classroom	12.5%	87.5%	0%
f.) they suggest rather than dictate or criticize	62.5%	37.5%	0%
g.) they actively look for and encourage my input	37.5%	62.5%	0%
h.) they help me feel more confident about what I do in the classroom	25.5	62.5%	0%
i.) they make suggestions that are useful to me	50.0%	50.0%	0%
j.) they try to make the project challenging	87.5	12.5%	0%

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

- **Gerry and Gary don't always seem to agree. On March 7 Gary said that Gerry wanted the write ups by March 21. On March 14, Gerry said they [reports] were not due on March 21 (1 participant).**

29. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?

5 (62.5%) 1.) very good.
3 (37.5%) 2.) good.
0 (0.0%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvement..

- **Erika has provided us with excellent readings (2 participants).**
- **More visits (1 participant).**
- **Support in publishing appreciated, ie.,organizing publishing, assisting (1 participant).**

30. In your opinion, how would you rate the support being provided to this program from your school's administrator(s)?

3 (37.5%) 1.) very good.
4 (50.0%) 2.) good.
1 (12.5%) 3.) poor.
0 (0.0%) 4.) very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

- **Good support, but very hands-off. We pretty much do our own thing with administrative blessing (1 participant).**
- **The principal has not really spent any time talking to the teachers or spent any time in the classroom (1 participant).**
- **I appreciate the support and guidance available when requested (1 participant).**

VI.PROGRAM USEFULNESS AND FINAL COMMENTS

31. Given that the first year of the project is approximately two-thirds completed, how would your rate the following items?

a.) I find that the information presented so far has been:

7 (87.5%) 1.) very useful.
1 (12.5%) 2.) useful.
0 (0.0%) 3.) somewhat useful.
0 (0.0%) 4.) not at all useful.

b.) I find that I have tried many of the ideas/techniques in my classroom.

8 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

c.) I find that I have adopted some of the ideas/techniques as part of what I do in my classroom.

8 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

d.) Based on your experiences thus far, what do you feel is the probability that you will make permanent changes to what you do in the classroom?

7 (87.5%) 1.) I am 100% certain I will make permanent changes.
1 (12.5%) 2.) I am 85% certain I will make permanent changes.
0 (0.0%) 3.) I am 50% certain I will make permanent changes.
0 (0.0%) 4.) I am 25% certain I will make permanent changes.
0 (0.0%) 5.) I am 100% certain that I will not make permanent changes.

e.) Based on your experiences thus far, have you seen positive changes in the performance of your students that can be stated to be a direct result of this project?

6 (75.0%) 1.) yes, I have noticed many positive changes.
2 (25.0%) 2.) yes, I have noticed a few positive changes.
0 (0.0%) 3.) no, I have not noticed any positive changes.
0 (0.0%) 4.) I do not know.

f.) Do you feel that this project has helped you to improve your teaching skills?

8 (100%) 1.) yes.
0 (0.0%) 2.) no.

Comments.

- **Having support of professionals to discuss/compare and share (1 participant).**
- **Having the time to develop approaches without pressure of providing monitoring of the whole class (1 participant).**

32. Name/describe some changes that you have already made in the way you work with children that have been a direct result of this project.

- **Able to fine tune my observations skills (4 participants).**
- **Decisions reflect theory and will have a positive effect on the child (4 participants).**
- **My learning environment has improved - I use it to the fullest (2 participants).**
- **Look more at what they [students] can do, not what they can't (2 participants).**

33. Given what has taken place between the second survey and now, do you have any additional suggestions that you have not already made for improving the Reading/Writing Immersion Project? If so, what are they?

- **I would like the discussion time to continue to develop along the collaborative line (1 participant).**
- **Reporting methods need more development (1 participant).**
- **Too many [people] missing visits, classes, leaving early (1 participant).**

34. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

- **After 3 months of working with my little R/WI group, I am tired of it (1 participant).**
- **Should have been some better arrangements made by the university people in regards to parking (1 participant).**
- **Would be useful to define role of the resource teacher (1 participant).**

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX D

ADMINISTRATORS' INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

OCTOBER, 1989

One of the conditions of the funding for this project is that it be evaluated. The purpose of this interview is to collect information from school administrators in order to provide evaluative information to the funder and also to provide information that will assist in making improvements, if needed, to the project. As previously discussed with you, **all responses will be kept completely confidential!**

The interviews will be read and scored by the assigned research assistant. Only compiled data will be shared and not the individual answers. After the data has been compiled, it will be shared with you at one of our meetings.

Please listen to each question carefully. If you would like me to repeat a question, I will do so. If you have any questions concerning the interview, please feel free to ask me, or to call Paul Madak (474-8712). We would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to assist us in the very important task of evaluating the Reading/Writing Immersion Project.

1. Do you feel that you are aware of all of the goals and objectives of this program?

   [ ] yes [ ] no

   Comments/suggestions.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. What are your goals for this project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. While the project has only just begun, how confident are you that your goals for the project will be met?

[ ] very confident.
[ ] somewhat confident.
[ ] not very confident.
[ ] not at all confident.

Why do you feel this way?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Again, while the project has only just begun, how useful do you feel this project has been to the teacher involved in the project?

[ ] very useful.
[ ] useful.
[ ] somewhat useful.
[ ] not at all useful.
[ ] don't know, too early to tell.

Comments

_____

_____

5. Again, while the project has only just begun, how useful do you feel this project has been to your school?

[ ] very useful.
[ ] useful.
[ ] somewhat useful.
[ ] not at all useful.
[ ] don't know, too early to tell.

Comments

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the opportunities you have had with regards to input into the project?

[ ] very satisfied.
[ ] somewhat satisfied.
[ ] somewhat dissatisfied.
[ ] not at all satisfied.
[ ] don't know, too early into the project.

Comments/suggestions for improvements.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. At this point in the project, rate the university staff with regard to the following areas.

	Always	Sometimes	Never	Don't know
a.) they are approachable	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
b.) they were willing to answer all my questions	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
c.) they empathize with the problems I have to deal with in the school	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
d.) they actively look for and encourage my input	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
e.) they make suggestions that are useful to me	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
f.) they try to make the project challenging	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
g.) they are easy to reach when I need to talk to them	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by Inner City Initiative Branch of Manitoba Education?

[ ] very good.
[ ] good.
[ ] poor.
[ ] very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. In your opinion, have changes actually occurred in the project classroom?

[ ] yes, a number of changes.
[ ] yes, a few changes.
[ ] no changes have occurred.
[ ] it is still too early to judge.
[ ] do not know.

Comments.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. At this point in time, how would you rate the quality of the project?

[ ] very high.
[ ] high.
[ ] low.
[ ] very low.
[ ] do not know, too early to tell.

Comments.

_____

_____

_____

11. At this point in time, do you have any suggestions that you would like to see implemented in order to improve the quality of the project? If yes, what are they?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY STAFF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

READING/WRITING IMMERSION: A DECISION MAKING LITERACY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

UNIVERSITY MEMBERS' INTERVIEW

May, 1990

1. How confident are you that your goals for the project have been met this year.?

   [ ] very confident.
   [ ] somewhat confident.
   [ ] not very confident.
   [ ] not at all confident.

   Why do you feel this way?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. How satisfied are you with the process that was used to select/identify the schools and teachers?

   [ ] very satisfied.
   [ ] somewhat satisfied.
   [ ] somewhat dissatisfied.
   [ ] not at all satisfied.

   Comments/suggestions for improving the process:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by the principals of the four schools?

[ ] very good. [ ] poor.
[ ] good. [ ] very poor.

How could they have provided better support:

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. In your opinion, how would you rate the support provided to the program by each division's administrators?

[ ] very good. [ ] poor.
[ ] good. [ ] very poor.

Comments/suggestions for improvements:

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Given that one of the main goals of this project is that a collaborative approach be utilized, how satisfied are you with the effort the teachers are making to provide input into the project?

[ ] very satisfied. [ ] somewhat dissatisfied.
[ ] somewhat satisfied. [ ] not at all satisfied.

Comments/suggestions for improvements:

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. What changes, if any, have occurred in the collaboration since the beginning of the project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. In your opinion, how would you rate the pace at which the group has progressed since December?

[ ] the pace has been very fast.
[ ] the pace has been fast, but not unreasonable.
[ ] the pace has been just right.
[ ] the pace has been slow.
[ ] the pace has been very slow.

Comments/suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

8.. At this point in the project, is the project:

[ ] exactly what you thought it would be.
[ ] very close to what you thought it would be.
[ ] somewhat close to what you thought it would be.
[ ] not at all what you thought it would be.

If not what you thought, how is it different?

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Do you think the second round of whole group observations were necessary? (Do you have any suggestions for improvements?)

[ ] yes. [ ] no.

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Based on the meetings and your observations do you feel that changes are occurring in the project classrooms?

[ ] yes, a number of changes.
[ ] yes, a few changes.
[ ] no changes have occurred.

Comments re: quality of changes:

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Do you feel that the teachers need more training? (In what areas do you feel that training is needed?)

[ ] yes. [ ] no.

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. When the teachers are working with identified students, how many children do you expect them to be working with at one time? (1-to-1 strategies?)

13. What changes, if any, have you observed in the identified children?

14. What would you expect the extra teachers (1/2 time sub) to be doing during the 2 1/2 hours they are in the classroom?

15. Do you feel that the extra teachers are being used appropriately?

[ ] yes. [ ] no.

Why do you feel this way?

16. What have been the most difficult aspects of implementing the program in the schools?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. What problems/obstacles, if any, have you encountered with the Reading/Writing Immersion program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. What advice would you give to someone initiating s similar program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. Do you have any other comments/concerns that you would like to add, but haven't been asked?

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION